DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 476 CG 014 494

AUTHOR Triana, Robert R.
TITLE Theory and Practice of Social Casework With Adolescents: A Review and Assessment of Research Reported During the Decade of the 1970's.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 162p.: Ph.D. Dissertation: Walden University, FL.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescent Development; *Adolescents; *Caseworker Approach; Caseworkers; Evaluation; Individual Characteristics; Intervention; *Mental Health; Research Methodology; *Research Needs; Social Work; Therapy

ABSTRACT

This review of research reported in the 1970's illustrates the contributions of social casework to the better understanding and treatment of adolescents. Thirteen studies, including experiments, case studies, theoretical expositions and program evaluations, are assessed and codified according to methodological (design and method of determining effectiveness): interventive (casework setting and approach): and client (age, sex, race, socioeconomics, presenting problems) variables. Study deficiencies reported are: (1) designs did not isolate variable effects or examine variable interactions: (2) dependent measures and methods of effectiveness assessment were not clearly defined: (3) casework interventions lacked detailed descriptions; and (4) characteristics and the role of social, cultural, and economic factors were not discussed. Flexibility and pragmatism are suggested as guidelines for practicing casework with adolescents. Caseworkers must have a knowledge of adolescent development and be able to shift between child and adult orientations. Implications and recommendations concern the practice, research, and assessment of social casework with adolescents. (NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189476

CG

ABSTRACT

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF SOCIAL CASEWORK WITH ADOLESCENTS: A REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH REPORTED DURING THE DECADE OF THE 1970's

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert R. Triana

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

By

Robert R. Triana

B.A., Gannon College

M.S.W., Fordham University, 1963

Eugene J. Loveless

Eugene J. Loveless, Ph.D., Advisor
Chief Psychologist
St. Vincent's Hall
Brooklyn, New York

CG 014494

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

WALDEN UNIVERSITY
April 1980

Copyright 1980 by Robert R. Triana

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine how social casework during the 1970's contributed to the better understanding and treatment of adolescents. Research reported during the 1970's was therefore identified, reviewed and assessed with the following two objectives in mind: (1) to learn what the research studies offered as likely paths toward effective practice with adolescents, and (2) from the research studies' strengths and weaknesses, to deduce recommendations for more useful future research with adolescents.

Thirteen such studies were identified, analyzed, classified, and codified according to certain methodological, interventive, and client variables. The studies included experiments, case studies, theoretical expositions, and program evaluations. The methodological variables concerned the design of the study and the method for determining effectiveness; the interventive variables concerned the casework setting and approach; and the client variables concerned the age, sex, race, socioeconomic class, and presenting problems of the adolescents. The problem of defining terms such as "social casework," "adolescence,"

MAY 1 1980

and "effectiveness of social casework" were also discussed.

Implications were drawn, and recommendations made, based both on the content of the 13 studies and on certain themes that were omitted. The implications and recommendations discussed concerned three areas: doing social casework with adolescents, conducting research on social casework with adolescents, and performing review-assessment studies of social casework.

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF SOCIAL CASEWORK WITH ADOLESCENTS: A REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH REPORTED DURING THE DECADE OF THE 1970's

By

Robert R. Triana

B.A., Gannon College

M.S.W., Fordham University, 1963

Eugene J Loveless

Eugene J. Loveless, Ph.D., Advisor
Chief Psychologist
St. Vincent's Hall
Brooklyn, New York

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

WALDEN UNIVERSITY
April 1980

Copyright 1980 by Robert R. Triana

Acknowledgements

The researcher wishes to thank the members of his sponsoring committee, Dr. Eugene J. Loveless, Dr. Robert W. Pitcher, and Dr. Mary C. Sengstock, for their guidance in the development of this dissertation. In addition, the researcher wishes to thank Professor Everett Busby of Fordham University Graduate School of Social Services, and Mr. Eric Bienstock of the Psychanalytic Institute for Clinical Social Work, for their invaluable advice, encouragement, friendship, and support. Finally, the researcher wishes to thank Robert Blakey, Martin Sheehy, M.D., Volkmar Peter, Spiros C. Vamvas, and Bernadine DeCarlo, C.S.W., for their influence on my life.

This dissertation is dedicated to my late father, Cosmo Triana, my grandparents Samuel and Josephine Triana, and my aunt Laura Emmanuele, whose lives were inspirational to me. All this has been made possible through them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES v

INTRODUCTION 1

Context of the Problem. 1

Statement of the Research Problem 4

Need for and Significance of the Study. 4

Defining Social Casework. 7

Defining Effectiveness of Social Casework 18

Defining Adolescence 24

Assumptions 26

Limitations 27

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE 28

On the Conduct of a Review-Assessment Study 28

Other Review-Assessment Studies of Casework 37

METHODOLOGY. 49

Sources Used. 49

Studies Considered. 49

Variables Examined. 50

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDIES 52

CODIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF THE STUDIES 72

According to Methodology. 72

According to Casework Setting 84

According to Casework Approach. 86

According to Client Characteristics 91

According to Presenting Problem Areas 97

Overall Assessment. 99

Summary 116

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PRACTICE OF CASEWORK WITH ADOLESCENTS. 118

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH ON CASEWORK WITH ADOLESCENTS 128

A RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER REVIEW-ASSESSMENT STUDIES OF CASEWORK 134

REFERENCES 137

VITA 149

LIST OF TABLES

1. Classification of the Studies According to Methodological Design 73
2. Classification of the Studies According to Method of Determining the Effectiveness of the Casework. . 80
3. Classification of the Studies According to Casework Setting. 85
4. Classification of the Studies According to Casework Approach. 87
5. Classification of the Studies According to Intervention. 91
6. Classification of the Studies According to Client Age and Sex 93
7. Classification of the Studies According to Race and Socioeconomic Status. 95
8. Classification of the Studies According to Presenting Problem Area 98
9. Summary Description of the Studies. 100

INTRODUCTION

Context of the Problem

The International Year of the Child, 1979, would seem to be an appropriate time for members of the various social science disciplines to look back over the 1970's to assess the contributions made by their particular professions to the general well-being of children--particularly those children commonly referred to as "adolescents."

For those in the mental health field in the United States, perhaps the best place to begin is the 1969 publication of Crisis in Child Mental Health: Challenge for the 1970's, by the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. Hailed as a "veritable Magna Charta for the Children of the United States" (27:517), the report cited the following statistics:

> One million four hundred thousand children under the age of eighteen needed psychiatric care in 1966. Of these, nearly one million did not receive the care they needed.
>
> Not a single community in the country provides an acceptable standard of services for its mentally ill children, with very serious lacks existing uniformly with respect to early therapeutic intervention. The officially recorded delinquency and youth crime rates have shown an alarming

> increase over the past decade.
>
> Each year almost one million of the nation's youth drop out of school and enter the adult world with inadequate skills and with diminished chances of becoming productive citizens (27:517).

Despite these warnings to the mental health professions in 1969, a 1979 New York Times article revealed that "suicide is now the third leading cause of death (after accidents and homicides) in the 15-to-24 age group" (47:30). Furthermore,

> while the number of suicides among children 10 to 14 years of age may not seem remarkable, the rate of suicide in that age range has risen 32 percent since 1968. This trend becomes even more ominous in light of the soaring rates of alcohol and drug abuse, criminal offenses and suicide among teen-agers. There has been an undeniable increase in self-destructive behavior among the youth of America (47:30).

Concurrent with this concern for the problems of adolescents, a public demand for accountability in the mental health professions has resounded throughout the 1970's. Social casework in particular, as a theory and as a practice, had been called on during the past decade to account for its theories and practices, both from inside and outside the profession.

The growing concern during the 1970's for the relative effectiveness of social casework can probably be traced to the 1970 study of public assistance families in New York by the Community Service Society and the Department of Social Services (77). The study used personal interviews of the clients to assess the effectiveness of the experimental procedures, one of which was social casework. Members of the families were asked questions about themselves and the other members in two areas: environmental changes and internal family changes. Specifically, they were asked whether they noted any changes in each of the following: economic status, consumer practices, family cohesion and relationships, role of mother, psychosocial functioning of the children, and psychological functioning and status of the female family head. The results of the study indicated that "the families in the experimental group, for the most part, did not appear to be functioning differently at the conclusion of this project than those in the control group" (77:194).

Reaction to the negative findings of the Mullen et al (77) study reverberated through the social work profession during the entire decade, as criticism and defense of the validity of casework theory and practice abounded (e.g. 12, 15, 28, 29, 30, 40, 80, 96, 104, 105, 109, 114). Plentiful, too, were the writings of caseworkers concerned with measurement and design in studies of casework service (e.g. 1, 17, 41, 45, 115). Despite the plethora of publications during the 1970's concerned with the effectiveness of social casework, no comprehensive assessment was produced. Furthermore, and in spite of the growing concern for adolescents, no attempt was made to review and assess a decade's worth of studies of casework with adolescents.

Statement of the Research Problem

The present study was motivated by a concern that a gap has existed between concern for adolescents and the accountability of social casework services. Consequently, the present study has attempted to review and assess studies reported during the 1970's which were concerned with the effectiveness of social casework with adolescents. In particular, this researcher has attempted to review, analyze, classify, assess, and synthesize the various components involved in the process of casework with adolescents. Throughout this study, the purpose has been to review and assess the contribution made by the research of the 1970's on social casework with adolescents.

Need for and Significance of the Study

The 1978 study by Wood examined 22 experimental and quasi-experimental research studies of the effectiveness of social work intervention. The 22 studies, published between 1956 and 1973, were classified and analyzed according to type of client and type of intervention. Although no specific category was made for adolescents, most of the studies of delinquency dealt with adolescents. Wood's major conclusion regarding the studies with delinquents was that neither the casework nor the groupwork employed was very effective. While critical of the inability of the studies to precisely define "casework" and "groupwork," Wood conceded that one could probably rule out groupwork as an effective tool, at least with delinquent adolescents, and suggested that only the casework approach might hold some hope for success. However, she noted, "the workers who focused casework only on intra-psychic variables generally met with the same poor results as the workers who focused only on group interaction variables" (119:440).

The outgrowth of Wood's study that is perhaps most germane to the present study can be found in her discussion of "what went wrong." Aside from methodological design faults, Wood stated that the relationship between the presenting problems and client's needs, and the outcome criteria applied, was either faulty or completely lacking.

Specifically, Wood maintained:

> Neither clients nor workers could have been clear about what was the clients' share of the change task and what was the workers' responsibility. The intervention applied bore no clear conceptual or logical connection to the problems in these adolescents' lives. . . . The negative outcomes may also have resulted from setting the intervention in advance, regardless of the kinds of problems to be treated and the kinds of people who had them (119: 440, 442).

Wood's conclusions should not be surprising, particularly in light of an apparent consensus in the mental health community on the enormity of the difficulties involved in treating adolescents. It has been maintained by Phillips (88), for example, that "one of the most difficult ages to deal with effectively in psychotherapy is adolescence. For a number of reasons . . . the adolescent presents many obstacles to helpful treatment" (88:78). The converse view is that much of the difficulty in treating the adolescent actually stems from the adult worker's lack of understanding. Illustrative of this point of view, D.I. Meyers has claimed that "what we seem to be facing perenially is a defense on the part of the adult against understanding and joining with the adolescent's attempts at change" (72:5).

Social caseworkers, in particular, have traditionally viewed the problems inherent in casework with adolescents as multi-dimensional, taking into account the individual and the caseworker as well as the treating agency and societal values. Despite this multi-faceted approach, too many social work agencies and social casework practitioners have been either unwilling or unable to provide successful treatment for adolescents. Paramount among the reasons for this failure has been, according to Levinson, the "lack of appreciation of the multitude of factors" (60:480). Thus there appears to exist an important need for increased emphasis on the uniqueness of social casework with adolescents.

Motivated by this rationale, this study has avoided continuing in the tradition of previous reviews of casework which considered all of the clients, or even all of the nonadult clients, as a single group (e.g. 28, 29, 30, 119). Rather, this study has restricted itself to those studies of casework that dealt with the unique individual called adolescent.

Defining Social Casework

The present research has attempted to remain unbiased about the various recognized approaches to defining casework practitioners, theories, and services. What follows, therefore, is a brief description of the major historical and current approaches to defining social casework, concluding with the set of general criteria used in the present study.

The first attempt to define social casework, according to Hartman's historical survey (40), was made by Richmond in 1922. Richmond defined casework as "those processes which develop personality through adjustments consciously effected individual by individual, between men and their social environment" (40:98-99). Additionally, she drew an operational distinction between direct treatment, or "the action of mind upon mind," and indirect treatment, or action through the environment (40:102).

Reynolds (93) said that social casework deals with "difficulties in the relationship between individuals or groups and their physical or social environment," and that it helps people with the "inevitable hazards of living" (93:6). Further refining the individual and environmental distinctions, Lowry (61) developed a three-aspect classification based on differential assessment of client need. The first aspect was helping the client make better use of his environment; the second used a dual approach to the individual in relation to his environment; and third, called personal or psychological, sought "to effect a better adjustment to his environment through a better adjustment to himself" (61:6). Lowry also specified that the medium was to be "the relationship between client and worker with the interview as the primary technic" (61:6).

Subsequent to Lowry's (61) definition, the dual approach to the individual in relation to his environment appears to have had general acceptance among social workers, according to Hartman (40:48). However,

> It was around the two poles of pure psychotherapy, on the one hand, and simple provision of concrete services, on the other, that confusion and controversy developed. The profession struggled with the question of whether the individualized and appropriate administration of a concrete service without any people-changing objectives was, in and of itself, casework practice or whether such tasks were a meaningful part of casework only when used as a tool in treatment, as an instrument to bring about individual change or growth (40:48).

The psychosocial model of social casework, as espoused by Hamilton (39), Hollis (42,43,44), and Meyer (69), is concerned with both the inner psychological realities of man and the social context in which he lives. Thus its foundation rests on Freudian psychoanalytic theory and advocates the use of differential sets of diagnostic procedures.

In contrast to the psychosocial model's stress on diagnosis, the functional approach, as described by Strean, "places major emphasis on the agency itself. Casework is not considered a form of psychosocial treatment but a method for administering some specific social service" (110:15). Developed from the theories of Otto Rank, a disiple of Freud, the functional approach in its present form stresses the importance of dividing the casework process into a beginning, a middle, and an ending phase, so that, as cited by Morris et al., "the potential of each time phase for the client may be fully utilized" (75:1202).

The problem-solving model in social casework, as introduced by Perlman (85), takes this view of the casework event: "a person with a problem comes to a place where a professional representative helps him by a given process" (85:4). Since its primary purpose is to help people deal with current problems, the model focuses only on those aspects of the personality that are involved in a particular problem, rather than on a whole-person diagnosis.

The behavior-modification approach, based on B. F. Skinner's theories of reinforcement and conditioning, has as its primary goal the learning and unlearning of behavior patterns. Another nonanalytic approach, task-centered casework, seeks to help the client achieve relatively short-term goals. According to Reid and Epstein (92), these goals may involve interpersonal problem-solving, better adjustment to the environment, or both.

A closer examination of the various approaches to social casework reveals several differences as well as similarities in their stated purposes, objectives, and processes. Although for the most part the differences seem to be in the degree and emphasis of the various aspects of casework, these differences may in fact create more qualitative differences in the final outcomes. All of the approaches except for behavior modification, for example, espouse some aspect of personality theory, whether classical Freudian or neo-Freudian. Behavior modification theorists such as Thomas (112), however, postulate certain laws and principles of human behavior which are not rooted in dynamic psychology, but rather are based on operant behavior and conditioning theory. None of the other theorists have appeared to discount the theories of behavior modification, however, and in fact at least one, Reid (91), has encouraged its application to other methods of casework:

> This kind of experimentation has demonstrated that specific treatment objectives can be realized and that these accomplishments can by systematically measured, and it has provided further evidence that the gains derived from highly focussed treatment are not rendered by losses in other areas. . . . We do not have to buy the theory and techniques of behavior modification

> in order to learn what it may have to teach about the goals of treatment (91:152-153).

In her comments on the distinguishing characterisitics of the various approaches to casework, Simon (104) said of the behavior modification approach that its "techniques, combined with the larger socio-behavioral approach, constitute a distinct school of thought for casework" (104:363).

In addition to personality theory, the analytical approaches to casework include in their theories--although each with varying degrees of emphasis and detail--concepts from ego psychology and techniques from role theory. Thus according to Simon (104), ego psychology concepts such as ego autonomy, drive for mastery, and competence, have enabled the analytical approaches to claim alliance with the "healthy" aspects of the personality or with the "healthy" defenses. Likewise, concepts from role theory appear to provide a common well of analytic theory for the analytic theorist, although it seems to be Perlman (86, 87) who has most directly advocated the adoption of role theory concepts to her problem-solving theory of casework, since she has specifically called for the use of role concepts for observation, assessment, and understanding of people in their intimate role relationships (86:197-203).

Aside from these borrowings from psychoanalytic theories, all of the casework approaches, including behavior modification (albeit to a lesser degree), have apparently drawn upon theoretical and empirical developments in sociology, social psychology, cultural anthropology, and biology. Thus, to a greater or lesser degree, the expositors of social casework theory and practice have apparently adopted such concepts as learning theory, adult socialization, small-group dynamics, development and function of cognition in behavior, and system theory from the social sciences; concepts of stress and homeostasis from the biological sciences; and a host of concepts concerning man as a social being from other related fields. Pointing out the somewhat inconsistent and trendy nature of these borrowings, Simon (104) has said: "For many years we have referred to a biopsychosocial view of man, being grandiloquently general about what we have derived from these three areas, but we have, alternately, emphasized one more than the other two" (104:366).

Perhaps the most regnant concepts applied during the 1970's to social work, and in particular to social casework, are those from system theory. In Simon's (104) view, "system theory seems to have some of the advantages of the function of role concepts. It seems to offer a frame of reference for thinking about and organizing ideas that have long been important to social casework theory and practice" (104:368). In Schwartz's (99) attempt to unify the various approaches and theories of social work under the umbrella of a system of social work, it was suggested that a synthesis of micro and macro theories might lead to a conceptual unification of the profession. Schwartz acknowledged that:

> . . . a persisting belief among social workers is that this profession has been split by differences which have been dichotomized in a series of formulations such as casework versus function, practice versus social action, and professionalism versus political activism. . . . Even though some of these formulations may lack precision, taken together they do connote differences in emphases and approaches to social work practice and education which are real and important for the development of social work theory (99:378).

Specific differences in these "emphases and approaches" are apparent in each of the particular phases of the casework process: the initial phase, the assessment of the situation, and the treatment of the client. Thus, while all the casework approaches appear to stress the importance of engaging the client in the helping process at the initial phase, they differ on the relative importance and utility of knowing the client's view of the problem.

All save perhaps the behaviorists do agree, however, that some form of treatment takes place at the initial contact with the client.

It would seem crucial to consider whether these differences in technique applied at the initial phase would perforce result in significant differences in some uniform outcome criteria applied at termination. It may well be that the theoretical orientation employed at the initial phase predetermines the theory and methods used during the entire case, as problem-solving caseworkers such as Perlman (85) have claimed. Or it may be that theoretical consistency should be sacrificed for an individual, eclectic approach, as suggested by Fischer (30). In any case, theorists will probably continue to differ on this aspect of casework so long as they continue to differ on assessment and treatment techniques.

Assessment, or diagnosis, has been one of the knottier issues contested by the different casework theorists . While all apparently have recognized the need for assessment in determining a guide for the treatment plan, they differ on the specific purposes of assessment and its relationship to casework technique. According to Morris et al. (75), the psychosocial and functional schools appear to differ greatly on the use and purpose of assessment, with the former stressing the need for ongoing differential diagnosis, and the latter emphasizing the role of the agency in providing an agreed-upon specific service. Hollis (42, 43, 44), for example, has placed great importance on the value of clinical classifications for diagnosis under the psychosocial--sometimes called diagnostic--approach. Smalley (106), on the other hand, as a representative of the functional approach, has preferred to stress the importance of understanding the "person-in-a-process."

Perhaps the most controversial question concerning assessment is what brings the client to the caseworker in the first place. Some caseworkers blame the problem on system dysfunction in families, others on inadequate adult functioning, or a problematic situation, or deficient or impaired coping mechanisms in response to hazardous events, or an inability to manage some aspect of one's life. Diagnosis appears to be specified most concretely when the theoretical orientation is behavior modification, since that theory requires a very specific assessment of discrete observable behavior. There does seem to be a certain amount of agreement, however, that asessment is prerequisite to treatment, even if the assessment is only tentative.

Treatment goals appear to form a rather wide band of theory. While all the theorists have advocated change in some form as the goal of casework, the kind and amount of change advocated vary greatly. On one end of the spectrum are the behaviorists, for whom change is measured in specific observable behavior (e.g. 112); on the other end are students of the psychosocial school, who are concerned with internal changes in perception (e.g. 44). Agreement in this area has been scant and perhaps consists merely of the universal recognition that, in Simon's words, "treatment is focused or partialized and that there is no goal for treating all problems, nor a goal of 'cure' in any absolute sense" (104:379).

Among all of the attempts to define social casework, some general common areas of agreement have become apparent. These are a concentration on the client as an individual and as an individual in relation to his environment, a goal of some type of change for the client or change in his relation to his environment, and an emphasis on the importance of the personal relationship between caseworker and client. Drawing on these common points, the following criteria were used in determining whether a particular service was to be considered "social casework":

1. The practitioner is a social worker.

2. The service is directed toward the individual client.
3. There is a direct, person-to-person relationship between the practitioner and the client.
4. The primary activity between the practitioner and the client is verbal interaction.
5. The primary concern is with either the client's psychological state, his interpersonal relationships, or his relation to his environment.
6. The primary objective is either to enable the client to change his psychological state (e.g. his feelings, attitudes), or to effect a change in his interpersonal or environmental relationships.
7. The objective is either time-limited (as in short-term crisis intervention), or open-ended.

Defining Effectiveness of Social Casework

Another major difficulty encountered in attempting to assess social casework research is the problem of defining precisely what is meant by the effectiveness of social casework.

Mullen had charged in 1968 that as one reviews attempts to define the casework process, what becomes evident is the "ambiguity and lack of uniformity in the definition of the methods and procedures that are discussed" (76:546). Throughout the 1970's, terms such as "caseworker," "clinical social worker," and "psychiatric social worker" have been used interchangeably without clarity, distinction, or uniformity. As stated by Fisher (28):

> Almost as difficult as defining casework, however, is the problem of specifying just what is meant by "effectiveness" (or, "success" or "improvement"). Obviously, the effects of intervention can show up in a number of ways, from subtle psychological changes to objective, observable changes in school grades, delinquency rates, and other performance dimensions (28:6).

One of the earlier attempts to measure performance and cause-effect relationships between interventive procedure and outcome was James Thompson's (113) four-point scale. He proposed that "efficiency" refers to "whether a given amount of resources was used in a given way to achieve the greatest results," and that the term "instrumental measurements" refers to the extent to which a specific outcome has been achieved, regardless of the absolute cost of the outcome (113:86). The other two points on Thompson's scale, "process-intrinsic measure" and "insight-extrinsic measure" involve assigning a value to some pre-set process or criteria, the former point using some process element inherent in the interventive procedure and the latter using some criteria totally outside the interventive procedure. A typical example of a process-intrinsic measure is the use of a client's continuation or discontinuation of service as an index of the effect of service. Examples of insight-extrinsic measures are grades and continuation in school, or ratings of the client by members of his family.

Even Hollis's (42) noteworthy effort to quantify casework interventive procedures has not provided a clear definition of effectiveness in behavioral terms, as evidenced by her definition of the "reflective process" as "the kind of change in the client's thought or understanding that could be expected to be the outcome of the client's or the worker's communication _if_ it were successful" (42:6-7). And further, she stated:

> It is also of no significance for the classification whether a judge or coder believes that under the circumstances in which it is employed the given procedure will in fact succeed in evoking the dynamic toward which it is directed. Nor is it pertinent whether it appears actually to have had this effect. That is, the classification is designed to be independent of outcome. . . . A procedure is not to be judged in terms of its outcome but rather in terms of its inherent nature (42:5).

Of course this "intra-psychic" approach to the question of measuring effectiveness is consistent with Hollis's psychosocial school of thought, which maintains that the goal of casework is to "endeavor to bring about some change in personality, some strengthening in the ego's ability to carry out its functions of enabling the individual to live more productively, less abrasively, and with greater satisfaction" primarily by "learning to understand what is going on in his current life" (44:180). It is clear that observable criteria for outcome in behavioral terms were of no concern to Hollis.

In task-centered casework, as espoused by Reid and Epstein (92), treatment goals are specific and limited. Relatively short-term targets are established by agreement between therapist and client. These targets may include interpersonal conflict, dissatisfaction in social relations, relations with formal organizations, role performance, social transition, reactive emotional distress, and inadequate resources.

A study using this approach to casework services, reported by Reid and Epstein (90), was carried out in a university hospital in Chicago, to test the model as well as a related task achievement scale for determining effectiveness. The achievement scale was scored by three judges, with the majority rating accepted in cases of disagreement. After reading the case records and research protocols, each client task was rated as "completely achieved," "substantially achieved," "partially achieved," or "minimally (or not at all) achieved." The researchers' rationale was that "generally a measure of task accomplishment is also a measure of the degree of alleviation of the specific problem to which the task is addressed" (92:219). This claim appears to have been substantiated, at least in the opinions of the clients themselves, since "fourteen of the nineteen clients thought that their overall situations were better or much better at the end of the service than at the beginning" (92:244). Finally, the researchers offered the following assessment of their scale as a measure of effectiveness:

> The Task Achievement Scale has certain advantages over more conventional global measures of changes that are based on the assumption that certain treatment goals apply to all cases. Such measures often fail to give specific information on precisely what changes have occurred. . . . Measures based on the assumption that certain changes are to be expected in all cases may be irrelevant, if not misleading. For example, changes in functioning or family interaction, which are typical of across-the-board measures in casework research, might have been germane in certain of our cases but not in others.
>
> Assessment of task achievement has

> at least one important drawback as a measure of outcome: variation in tasks makes it difficult to make comparisons across cases. . . . An eventual solution may lie in developing ways of classifying tasks according to type or degree of difficulty, so that similarities and differences can be taken into better account (92:241).

Others have attempted to describe effectiveness in terms of general, guiding principles. Tropp (114), for example, suggested that effectiveness be evaluated in terms of degree of success based on the difficulty of achieving the desired result, rather than in absolute terms, and if the solution of the primary problem or problems is beyond present abilities or practicalities, then effectiveness must be evaluated under lowered expectations.

Stating the case even more simply, Perlman (85) claimed that "the end of this process is contained in its means: to so influence the client-person that he develops effectiveness in coping with his problem and/or to so influence the problem as to resolve it or vitiate its effects" (85:5). And Briar's (12) proposed criterion of effectiveness is simply whether the service implemented actually did the client any good.

Simon (104) summarized the problem of differing viewpoints on definitions of terms in the following statement:

> All treatment approaches have a goal of change, modification, or improvement in relation to the situations that come to the attention of caseworkers. Within this global goal, however, there are differences in the extent of change envisioned in the focus for change, and in the definition of change (104:378).

Thus an integral part of the present research study of social casework with adolescents has been to examine each study's definition or concept of effectiveness. Since there appears to be no agreed-on definition, each researcher's definition of effectiveness has been considered within the context of the particular study. In agreement with Wood (119), therefore, this researcher has been acutely aware that

> . . . a lack of standardization among outcome measures makes cumulative evidence difficult to assess. The interventive variable is either different among the studies, inadequately defined, or inadequately controlled. The relationship of the definition and measures of outcome to the problem being intervened in varies, and the outcome measures also vary in the degree of validity and reliability achieved (119:451).

Defining Adolescence

In psychological terms, adolescence has been described, by Mintz (74) and Russian (97), as "a period of growth and expansion of ego functioning" (74:61), in which the realization of "sexual potency challenges the previously resolved oedipal situation" (97:212). The image is one of great turmoil and extreme and conflicting feelings. In the words of Phillips, "the resultant picture of the adolescent is that of an individual whose feelings and actions are highly similar to those of persons passionately and unhappily in love or mourning" (88:78).

In manifest behavioral terms, according to Levinson (60), the problems of the adolescent

> . . . run the gamut from normal adolescent adjustment reactions to profound disturbances. The more imposing difficulties include severe academic and work problems, unwanted pregnancy, delinquency, increasing drug use, psychosomatic disturbance, physical and organic handicaps, severe depression, homicidal tendencies, and chronic and acute schizophrenic reactions. Problems of sexual crises are frequently involved in the adolescent's difficulties (60:480).

Webster's dictionary has defined "adolescence" as "youth, or the period of life between puberty and maturity." Meanwhile "youth" has been defined in terms of "adolescence." However, "puberty" is commonly designated legally as fourteen for boys and twelve for girls," while "maturity" has received no particular age specification. The National Association of Social Workers (75) has likewise pointed out that "one problem is the definition of the term 'youth'. . . . The current literature uses the terms 'adolescence' and 'youth' interchangeably to the extent that a definition of one defines the other" (75:1549-1550). Further complicating the feasibility of assigning "adolescence" to a particular age range is the phenomenon observed by Erikson (24):

> As technological advances put more and more time between early school life and the young person's final access to specialized work, the stage of adolescing becomes an even more marked and conscious period (24:128).

In the absence of an agreed-on definition, therefore, the present research has followed the suggestion of the National Association of Social Workers (75) concerning a definition of adolescence. That is, it should "not be equated with specific age range but rather be defined functionally in relation to youth's role in society between childhood and adulthood" (75:1550).

Assumptions

The present research has assumed the following:

1. Unless indicated otherwise, reports of "casework" done by "social workers" have been accepted as such, within the context of the definitions stated here.
2. Unless indicated otherwise, use of the

designation "adolescent" has been accepted as such, within the context of the understanding discussed here.

Limitations

This researcher has recognized the following as limitations of the present study:

1. In the analysis of casework research studies with adolescents, only those published in the United States during the 1970's have been considered (precisely, from January 1970 through December 1979).
2. Only those studies in which social casework (as defined previously) was the primary modality have been analyzed, although studies involving other modalities may have been discussed tangentially.
3. Since only those studies that have appeared in print can be examined, any implications or conclusions drawn from the analysis cannot be assumed to apply to studies of casework with adolescents that have not appeared in print during the 1970's (before 1970 or after December 1979).

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The present section reviews the literature relevant to this study. The overall purpose of this review is to draw on existing knowledge as it relates to the primary purpose and methodological design of this study. This literature review is presented in two parts: a discussion of selected literature on conducting review-assessment studies, and a discussion of some other review-assessment studies of casework.

On the Conduct of a Review-Assessment Study

What follows is a review of the literature pertaining to conducting a review-assessment study like the present one. The literature selected for discussion is of direct concern to the present research because it relates to the theoretical and empirical nature of review and assessment, to the specific problem of reviewing and assessing reports of the effectiveness of social work intervention, and to the particular rationale for the design of this study.

A controversy appears to exist concerning the approach to building social work knowledge. On one side are those who argue that theoretical formulations should precede any investigation of empirical knowledge, and on the other side are those who argue that theory can be developed as a consequence of an examination of existing knowledge. The present research has sought to conform, for the most part, to the latter approach, since this researcher agreed with Kadushin (49) who maintained that

> . . . it is necessary to know what knowledge is possessed (which requires organization) as it is to know how to organize the knowledge possessed. A beginning might be made at developing a cognitive map of the terrain, at collecting specific bundles of systematically organized knowledge clusters. It is necessary to collect and sort out the data, separate fact from fantasy, knowledge from guess-work, speculative inference--however logical --from validated conclusions. Side by side with theory elaboration, theory adaptation, theory formulation, is needed a major project of fact gathering, fact-synthesizing, fact-systematizing (49:16).

In the same vein, Maas (63) has suggested for social work in general, that the development of further theories ought to begin with studies of how to "codify practice as it is now carried on" (63:48). Supporting "codification" as a prerequisite for theory development, Merton (68) held not only that can codification of knowledge lead to the "co-development of viable sociological theory and pertinent empirical research," but also that it can lead to the discovery of "theoretic problems which would be readily overlooked if the several empirical findings were not re-examined within a single context" (68:96). In this light it is worthwhile to note Merton's definition of "codification," particularly since it describes the approach employed in the present study:

> Codification involves orderly, disciplined reflection. . . . It entails the discovery of what has in fact been the strategic experience of scientific investigators, rather than the invention of new strategies of research. But the discovery of the one may facilitate the invention of the other. . . . Codification is the orderly and compact arrangement of systematized fruitful experience with procedures of inquiry and with the substantive findings which result from the use of these procedures (68:12-13).

Of course terms such as "fruitful experience" and "substantive findings" in Merton's definition are subject to interpretation, and the resulting "orderly and compact arrangement" will necessarily depend on the quality of the "procedures of inquiry" that are subject to this "orderly, disciplined reflection."

In particular, for investigations of procedures of inquiry in social work, Maas (63) maintained that "the core of any social work theory is formulation of what social workers do and the specific conditions under which they act in specific ways" (63:48). Acknowledging his bias for "the organization of knowledge about practice in terms as close to behavioral descriptions as possible," Maas suggested that theory be an outgrowth of these "molecular units of interaction" (63:57). Kadushin (50) agreed with Maas:

> The phenomena with which different researchers are concerned are too diverse to expect that a single comprehensive theory would have explanatory power for all. Little theories are needed--theoryettes--that are sufficient unto these diverse phenomena (50:63).

Further along this line, the present research is in agreement with Maas (63) who proposed that

> . . . social work theory development may progress along the route of our developing many theories of practice, each concerned with a client group grappling with one or another type of stressful situation. There are obviously common features among them, which in time may be synthesized, but there are also certain unique aspects to each (63:59).

It is, of course, on the "unique aspects" of the adolescent client that the present research has focused. However in terms of the development of the theoretical base regarding adolescents (and children in general), Kadushin observed in 1971 that "there is apparently no general theoretical system applicable . . . that holds the allegiance of any sizable group of researchers" (50:62-63). A search of the literature by this researcher has revealed that this was apparently still true in 1979.

Empirical data, however, continue to demonstrate that adolescents are unique, psychologically, emotionally, and behaviorally (see the Introduction for discussion of this point) and therefore that they need to be related to in terms of their particular needs, as people distinct and apart from their family units (e.g. the adolescent in casework treatment as an individual, as distinguished from the adolescent as a member of a family unit in family treatment). Kenniston and the Carnegie Council on Children (52) have advocated this shift in focus, pointing out that

> . . . as a result of the escalation during the 1960's of youthful experimentation with alcohol, drugs, and sex, the vast majority of states have passed laws permitting minors . . . to seek treatment on their own for venereal disease; a smaller number permit minors to seek help for alcohol or drug dependence, and to obtain birth control information or devices. In 1976, the Supreme Court ruled that a state could not make parent's approval a precondition for abortion in the first trisemester, no matter what the age of the pregnant girl. A half dozen or so states now

> permit children above a certain age (fourteen to sixteen) to obtain other kinds of medical or psychiatric treatment on their own (52:199).

In support of society's widespread consideration of adolescents as unique individuals, Kenniston claimed that "some families are so out of touch with their children's problems and needs that their younger members must be given access to medical care for survival" (52:199). As indications of the severity of this situation, Kenniston cited statistics showing that "there are 100,000 youths placed in adult jails or police lockups every year" (52:195), "suicide is the second leading cause of death of youngsters fifteen to twenty-four" (52:200), "one in twenty teen-agers has a 'drinking problem'" (52:200), and that "teenage mothers give birth each year to more than 600,000 children who have higher than average risk of birth defects" (52:199). Furthermore, while Kenniston noted that "in 1970, there were 255,000 children in welfare institutions, group homes, detention homes, shelters, training schools, mental hospitals, and schools for the handicapped" (52:196), he also noted that "of 1,000 New York children whose families sought institutionalization . . . 72 percent had had no prior psychotherapy, 85 percent no prior evaluation, and 71 percent no special education" (52:193).

Hence, given Kenniston's (52) advocacy for considering the adolescent as an individual, together with the rationale of Kadushin (49, 50) and Maas (63) concerning the process of building social work knowledge, the primary thrust of the present research appears well-grounded. Since casework has been considered primarily an individual-oriented process with no one particular theoretical bias (see Defining Social Casework in the Introduction), the present research constitutes, in Merton's (68) words again, "orderly, disciplined reflection" for "the discovery of what has in fact been the strategic experience of scientific investigators" (68:12).

Among the variables examined in the present study are also the characteristics and presenting problem areas of the adolescent clients. Massarik (65) has considered these variables to be an integral part of "the concept of 'need' in social work" (65:388).

It is also important to consider the particular setting and process used in a research study or report of social casework. Massarik however, has pointed out the following difficulty:

> There is considerable feeling in the social work community, perhaps particularly by casework practitioners, that to

> "do research" on the client while he is a client may be a dangerous practice; the assumption is that to use the client as "a guinea pig" while he is involved in a helping relationship with the agency interferes with the helping process itself. As a result, the client has been studied indirectly, most frequently as seen through the eyes of the caseworker (65:392).

Massarik's (65) last comment also raises the question of the validity of measures of effectiveness which rely on such indirect sources. As "much evaluative research . . . in casework rests squarely upon the case record as a data source" (65:394), one can naturally question whether the data is sufficiently accurate and complete to support valid judgements. While cautioning researchers that "the hazards of using records . . . are great indeed" (65:395), Massarik also pointed out that even the alternative follow-up study design faces "a variety of problems" (65:397).

The need for a dependable measure of the effectiveness of social casework, however, has for some time, and will no doubt continue to be, widely discussed (see Defining Effectiveness of Social Casework in the Introduction). Munson (78) has traced the first evidence of this concern back to 1922, yet it appears that a satisfactory solution has yet to be found, since calls for improved measures of accountability are evident in the writings of Fischer (30), Rosenberg and Brody (96), Tropp (114), Wood (119), and others. In fact, it is difficult to distinguish any qualitative difference between these more recent calls for accountability and that of Wolins in 1960:

> Social work, existing to meet certain requirements of the social system which supports it, is obliged to prove its operations productive and efficient (118:247).

Wolins went further, however, in proposing general guidelines for evaluating measures of effectiveness. In particular, he stated that "when effectiveness is to be measured, it is necessary to decide for whom, for what, for how long, and under what circumstances effectiveness is desired" (118:248). Furthermore, he maintained that studies on the effect of social work intervention should be "no different from the scientific method used elsewhere" (118-250). Delineating the eight possible combinations of subject condition (natural or artificial), intervention (natural or contrived), and measurement (inquiry or observation), Wolins maintained that "research on the effect of social work activity has fallen largely into four of these: the survey, the case study, the field experiment, and the classic experiment" (118:251). Since the present study has not restricted itself to examining only one type of design, it was recognized in agreement with Wolins, that:

> All of these methods of research--survey, case study, experiment--have been used in social work attempts to measure effect, each providing information which clearly describes the subject, the stimulus, and the result, and shows their relationship to one another (118:251).

Thus, unlike Fischer's (28, 29) relatively recent reviews of casework, the present research has included quasi-experimental and nonexperimental studies in its review and assessment.

Other Review-Assessment Studies of Casework

What follows is a discussion of certain other studies that reviewed or assessed casework research. The purpose of this discussion is to highlight some of the procedural techniques and approaches in these other studies which have been of concern to this researcher in conducting the present review-assessment study.

As mentioned earlier, Fischer's (28, 29) reviews considered only those studies of casework that employed control or comparison groups. Such a restriction, however, led to his discarding of several studies, which, although perhaps not methodologically up to Fischer's standards of good research, might have nevertheless revealed useful information on the effectiveness of casework. But then Fischer's purpose was not to review and assess what had been done to contribute to an understanding of the effectiveness of casework but rather to prove or disprove the effectiveness of casework. Such a motivation, this researcher maintains, is misguided, and the present researcher has put forth no such hypothesis. Rather, this researcher agreed with Wood (119) who held that

> . . . attempting to find global answers to global questions such as whether casework is effective makes little sense as a researcher endeavor in itself. . . . Furthermore, the profession can do little more than become defensive and confused in reaction to such global charges of ineffectiveness since they offer little contribution to developing and improving practice (119:437).

Likewise, Briar (11), in his review of family casework services, countered the question of whether or not casework is effective with this rejoinder:

> It is not an especially useful question for practitioners, since it admits of only two definitive answers: yes or no. Either answer is important for evaluative purposes, but neither is very informative to the practitioner. If the answer is yes, presumably the practitioner gains the comfort that

> comes from the knowledge that his activities are helpful. But if the answer is no, the practitioner is left with a serious dilemma. He has been told that his methods are not effective, but not what he may do to improve them (11:116).

Fisher's definition of casework, as simply that which caseworkers do, is both simplistic and circuitous. In defining the service of casework in terms of the identity of the practitioner, he has failed to identify any specifics of the process. As Nitzberg has critically pointed out, "such nonspecificity in casework interventions greatly increases the likelihood that services will have no impact on the client at all" (80:247). Further it has been noted by Alexander and Siman that "Fischer makes the implicit assumption that all caseworkers do the same things, have the same educational backgrounds, possess the same skills, and have the same notion about outcomes (1:105).

In addition, Fischer's further stipulation that "caseworker" be understood as meaning "M.S.W." eliminated from his study that segment of casework research done at agencies which employ social workers who are not at the graduate level. In fact, Wood's (119) review revealed that having a master's degree in social work was probably not an asset, and went still further by saying "the reason so many of the research studies reviewed showed negative outcomes is that the practitioners involved in them--M.S.W.'s as much as or perhaps more than B.A.'s--were not competent" (119:455).

Consequently, in the interest of being sufficiently encompassing and sufficiently specific, the present research has attempted to concern itself with casework, and to caseworkers, as they are generally known among practitioners in both public and private agencies and in private practice. For this reason, a general definition of casework was developed for use in this study, based on what appears to be common threads of understanding among diverse conceptions of casework (see Defining Social Casework in the Introduction). In this way, it is hoped that the present study can contribute to a more realistic description of what caseworkers are, and what caseworkers do on behalf of a specific client population.

While this researcher does not contest Fischer's (29) conclusion that the studies he examined indicate that the casework services were probably not effective, any statement stronger than this would be logically improper, since the inability to demonstrate effectiveness of casework does not prove that casework is indeed ineffective.

On the one hand Fischer noted the lack of evidence "to clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of any form of psychodynamically-based approach in casework, counseling, or psychotherapy" (29:324), yet on the other hand concluded that "clients receiving professional casework services were shown to deteriorate" (29:110). Hudson (45) has referred to Fischer's (28) thinking as an effort to "push the findings of evaluative research beyond the limits for which they were intended" (45:448). With these cautions in mind, the present study has taken care not to fall guilty of the researcher elitism of which Nitzberg (80) accused Fischer (29). "He seems to apply more rigorous standards to the original studies than he does to his review of them" (80:247).

In contrast with Fischer's (28,29) studies, Wood's (119) review of 22 "research projects" began with a motivation more in line with that of the present study. In particular, Wood sought to answer the following questions:

> What can direct practitioners of social work learn from research evaluating practice outcomes? Why was the intervention successful or unsuccessful? What propositions, prescriptions, and proscriptions of practice theory have been validated, invalidated, or modified? What has been added to the empirical base of practice theory (119:437)?

However, Wood's relatively strict criteria--applied for the acceptance of a study for consideration--resulted in the rejection of 31 other studies. While those discarded studies may not have satisfied Wood's criteria of research adequacy, there may very well have been at least some bits of information among those studies that could have combined to contribute to the resolution of her research questions.

Thus, as Fischer had done, Wood rejected any study that had no control, comparison, or contrast group. Yet she acknowledged in her summary that "a number of social work writers have recently been calling for a 'moratorium' on group-comparison evaluative research paradigms. . . . It may be necessary for research to return at least partially to the case study" (119:455). Even Briar (11), seven years earlier, had stated that

> . . . a somewhat less restricted definition of "research" will be followed in this review, not because the reviewer has relaxed his methodological biases, but out of concern that the stringent standards followed in the previous review may have eliminated exploratory efforts that exposed important avenues for research (11:109).

Another pertinent criticism of Wood's (119) design is that, although she set out to categorize the studies according to the client group served, as well as according to the mode of intervention, the studies of casework with adolescents were grouped with other studies of children under "Studies of Delinquency." Two points are to be noted here. First, "delinquency" is a behavioral manifestation or symptomatology, and not a defining characteristic in the same sense as "children" or "the aged," as she titled other categories of clients. Second, and as noted in the earlier discussion, adolescents are a unique and distinct group, and linking them with other children (such as first-graders), based simply on a common symtomatology, does not seem reasonable. However, Wood did take care to be very specific in describing the sex, age, ethnic background, and socioeconomic class of the subjects in each of the studies who comprised the category "Delinquency." Thus the reader is at least given some opportunity to differentiate among subjects when interpreting Wood's conclusions concerning casework research with delinquents.

Three of the six studies reviewed by Grey and Dermody (36) researched social casework specifically with delinquent adolescents. Significant in their analysis was the author's recognition that

> Casework with delinquents . . . deals

> with particulary difficult clientele. Therefore, it would seem useless to expect good results under treatment circumstances in which basic requirements are either poorly understood or inadequately founded and implemented (36:538).

This observation has been substantiated by other reviewers. Berleman (4) for one, in his review and critique of a delinquency-prevention experiment using casework carried out in England claimed that such experiments

> . . . are so vexingly difficult to execute that they are inevitably targets for criticism. Most generally, these experiments lack a necessary adequacy in both their service and methodological components (4:290).

Langley and Drone (58) have likewise referred to the multitude of difficulties that hamper the successful treatment of juvenile delinquents, focusing on the political, legal, and societal biases that interfere. Specifically, they charged, the "unjust and developmentally crippling treatment of youths . . . appears to characterize contemporary juvenile justice"(58:561).

Grey and Dermody (36) did not, however, shirk from their goal of assessing the casework studies of juvenile delinquents. In particular, they criticized the studies' methods of client recruitment, the different frequencies of contact reported, and the relative appropriateness of the interventive procedures implemented. They concluded that variations in these variables represented differences between "good and bad casework" (36:538), which illustrated "a wide discrepancy between the general statements about treatment approach and the ways in which they actually are implemented" (36:537). These, and other variables were examined in the authors' attempt to make research outcomes relevant to theory as well as to actual practice, a goal shared by Wood (119) and this researcher.

Reflecting the purpose of the present research, Grey and Dermody stated that while they were concerned with the apparently negative research findings regarding the effectiveness of casework, their intention was "to explore that issue in search of additional clues toward its resolution" (36:537), recognizing, unlike Fischer (28, 29), that "major enigmas like these cannot be answered by a single article" and that "one way to solve the problem is to look at some of the evidence which has caused the storm" (36:537).

Grey and Dermody's (36) criteria for selection of the studies reviewed, however, differed from any of those discussed thus far: "well-known studies were favored so that readers might be in a better position to form an opinion about the facts" (36:537). Generalized conclusions, therefore, must be understood in the context of this highly select sample of studies. Their suggestions, however, appear to have the soundness of careful study, as well as the support of other research-reviewers mentioned previously. For example, they stated:

> Two projects using the same type of . . . casework may have quite different results with various target populations. . . . Advances in casework investigation and practice clearly require not only more careful identification of the kinds of clients to whom treatment is addressed, but also more careful specification of the kinds of techniques actually being used (36:539).

In further agreement with other reviewers discussed earlier (e.g. 65, 118), Grey and Dermody (36) outlined some questions to be considered in any study designed to assess casework effectiveness:

> Which casework orientation or theoretical base is being tested? What practice model is being used to test it, and how accurately does it implement its theoretical base. By what means is the practice model being identified in the research situation? To what target population is the intervention addressed? And what rationale is offered for using the selected practice model with this population? Is the research investigating

> the efficacy of casework theory and practice or the efficacy of a total social welfare program or system (36:543)?

Segal's (100) study, susceptible to criticism for its statistical presumptions and inaccuracies, treaded a fine line between being a review of social casework and a review of psychotherapy. As Gurman (37) remarked:

> Attempts such as Segal's to answer such broad-gauged questions as "Is social work therapeutic intervention effective?" must forever go unanswered because it lacks sufficient specificity. . . . Segal does not follow through on his apparent awareness that all social work interventions are not the same. . . . Perhaps the more relevant issue, not addressed by Segal, is whether the latter involves treatment methods and change criteria that are fundamentally different from those of counseling and psychotherapy (37:139).

Segal (100) presented no criteria for distinguishing between "social casework" and "psychotherapy," neither a simplistic Fischer-like statement nor a list of requirements such as those presented in the present study (see Defining Social Casework in the Introduction). However, one can almost consider that an "understandable error," in light of the confusion discussed earlier concerning the apparent lack of clear and precise definitions of what is done, and who does it, in social casework. In this regard, at least, Segal's study is illustrative of much of what has been discussed in this review of the literature.

METHODOLGY

Sources Used

The following sources were used to locate literature on social casework with adolescents:

Abstracts for Social Workers, published by the National Association of Social Workers, Washington, D.C., categorizes and abstracts the literature of every professional journal related to social work in the United States, as well as some foreign journals, particularly those of Canada and England. It has also abstracted doctoral dissertations in social work since 1975.

Social Service Review, edited by the Faculty of the University of Chicago and published by The University of Chicago Press, abstracts doctoral dissertations in social work through 1974. It also reviews books published in social welfare, and reviews government reports and public documents relevant to social welfare.

Studies Considered

The studies considered were those that represent actual research, or description, or outcome studies, that is, studies in which the casework described was proposed or actually performed. Experimental, quasi-experimental, and nonexperimental studies (such as a theoretical case-study) were included.

An examination of Abstracts for Social Workers and Social Service Review has revealed 13 such studies concerned primarily with the technique of casework practice or the particular presenting problem area of the adolescent client. Examples of techniques are short-term and long-term approaches, combining casework and group work, and interviewing techniques; examples of presenting problems are delinquency, alcohol addiction, drug addiction, unwanted pregnancy, sexuality, work or career problems and school problems.

Variables Examined

Five variables were examined, analyzed, and codified;

1. The methodological design of the studies and the measures of effectiveness employed.
2. The casework setting, for example, private practice, public agency, residential treatment home.
3. The casework technique, theory, and orientation.

4. The characteristics of the adolescent clients, including race, socioeconomic class, sex, and age.
5. The presenting problem areas, such as sexuality, delinquency, addiction, interpersonal and family problems, and school problems.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDIES EXAMINED

The purpose of this section is to acquaint the reader with studies discussed in the ensuing chapters. The studies are presented here in chronological order, according to the date of publication.

Caroff, Lieberman, and Gottesfeld (18): The drug problem: treating preaddictive adolescents

This exposition on the casework treatment of preaddictive adolescents suggested specific approaches based on the authors' understanding of adolescent development and societal values concerning drug usage.

The researchers, drawing on their experiences with 20 private cases over a two-year period, stressed the importance of effecting a change in an adolescent's perception of drug usage. The goal of such casework, then, was to get the adolescent to view drug usage as "an additional problem to be worked out." To achieve this goal, it was strongly urged that the caseworker, as well as the parents, take a definite negative stand against using any drugs whatsoever. Toward this end, the workers insisted that the parents also be involved in their own casework, to help them clarify their understanding of the family's interactions of normal adolescent development, and of the self-destructive nature of drugs. The workers thus viewed their role as threefold: as re-educator of the parents, as counselor to the adolescent, and as "communication link" between parents and adolescent.

Although no case illustrations were given, the authors reported that their experience had indicated a trend from the use of marijuana and other nonaddictive drugs to the use of addictive drugs. In addition, they noted that drug use was apparently on the rise among younger adolescents and among middle-class and affluent adolescents.

Kerns (53): Planned short-term treatment, a new service to adolescents

This study was an attempt to train the social work staff of a youth service agency in the use of planned short-term treatment with adolescents. The report describes the experiences of the staff in learning to use the techniques and presents two case illustrations that typify these experiences. The primary motivation for the attempt to use planned short-term treatment (PSTT) was based on the administration's belief that the agency's adolescent clients could benefit more from goal-oriented casework than from long-term intensive psychotherapy.

The methods of PSTT were employed for one year in approximately 130 cases. In weekly staff sessions workers and supervisors discussed the cases, session by session, emphasizing employment of the PSTT techniques. Well-structured forms were used in place of the usual case record, and these forms had to be filled in after each session with the client. The author provided no information concerning the characteristics or presenting problems of the clients served by PSTT, except for the two case illustrations.

The caseworkers who used PSTT concluded that the approach was helpful with their adolescent clients. They felt that, by setting a time limit, PSTT allayed some of the adolescents' anxieties about not being "normal." The staff also felt that the planned goals and time limit forced the workers to make the best use of their professional expertise. The effectiveness of the casework was also assessed in each case by the adolescent and the parents. However, the writer did not report these assessments.

Webb and Riley (116): Effectiveness of casework with young female probationers

This experimental study set out to determine whether young woman (mean age 20.6) on probation could benefit from casework treatment at an outside, voluntary casework agency. Fifty-eight women, referred by the probation department, were involved in the study which lasted for one year. The researchers gave only a general description of these subjects.

Three measures of effectiveness were used as a pre-test and a post-test: The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, a form of semantic differential, and a set of behavior correlates. Statistically significant differences between experimental (casework) and control (no casework) groups were found for the following characteristics: acceptance of authority, and acceptance of the dictates of one's superego. Hypotheses concerning differences in acceptances of personal responsibility, self-concept, ability to delay impulse gratification, and resourcefulness and adaptability were not supported by the data. The researchers maintained that the behavioral correlates, based on ratings by the probation officers, indicated overall a high degree of improvement in functioning by the experimental subjects compared with the controls, although supporting data for this contention were not provided.

The researchers concluded that since the subjects did not come for treatment voluntarily, their relative success indicated that motivation might not be as crucial for successful treatment as is generally assumed. They conceded, however, that several of the changes in the experimental subjects may have been more a result of socialization and maturation than a result of personality change through casework.

McLaney (67): Casework with a trouble teen-ager and drug abuser

A detailed case study of a drug-abusing teenager, this report described the implementation and results of psychotherapeutic casework. Written by the caseworker, the report described in detail the presenting problems, psychosocial history, and family background of the 18-year-old female client at a family service agency.

The goals of treatment, stated by the caseworker, were defined in terms of improving the girl's relationships with friends, boyfriends, and family members, rather than in terms of eliminating her use of drugs. However, the caseworker's assessment of the girl's improvement concluded that the girl's eventual decrease in drug use was an expected by-product of the overall effectiveness of treatment. Other indicators of treatment effectiveness, as assessed by the caseworker, were less frequent use of drugs over the past year, ability to form more meaningful relationships, a change in the type of men chosen as dates, enrollment in college and participation in activities, an increase in self-confidence, and less dependency on family members.

The caseworker concluded that the girl's improved insight into her emotional problems after one year of treatment allowed her to decrease her dependency on drugs, even though the "drug problem" was not focused on in treatment. In the caseworker's opinion, the increased stimulation from meaningful relationships had begun to replace the stimulation of drugs. Although the girl had not given up all drug use, the substantial reduction in the amount and type of drugs used was felt to be a more realistic achievement than total abstinence. A termination date of six months hence was agreed on by caseworker and client. However, goals for these last six months, such as total abstinence from drugs, were not specified.

Berleman, Seaberg, and Steinburn (5): The delinquency prevention experiment of the Seattle Atlantic Street Center:

A final evaluation

The Seattle Atlantic Street Center delinquency prevention experiment was a study conducted with volunteer juvenile boys. The setting was a small settlement house and the workers were all male social workers at the masters level. The study, which spanned seven years, involved a three-year pretest phase, a two-year service phase, and a two-year postservice and evaluation phase. The primary purpose of the study was to determine whether the boys who were exposed to social services, which included casework, would reduce the level of their acting-out behavior. Evaluation of service effectiveness demonstrated no statistically significant impact of the treatment.

The conceptual, methodological, and service components of the study were discussed by the researchers in great detail. Aspects of theories of juvenile delinquency were examined and operationalized in the pretest phase, resulting in the development of working hypotheses for the experiment, and in the construction of two measurement instruments: a questionnaire for the subjects and a questionnaire for the parents of the subjects. In designing the questionnaire items, extensive use was made of school disciplinary files and police files, which were used as the dependent measure.

"Seriousness scales" were developed for coding the information in these files, after consultations with teachers and police officers.

The researchers maintained that the services given to the experimental subjects, including individual casework, groupwork, and family work, represented more intensive treatment than was rendered in all such prior experiments. However, the detailed statistical analyses revealed that the acting-out behavior of the experimental boys was not significantly reduced. The researchers concluded that perhaps such inner city delinquent youth require radically different kinds of interventive procedures in combination with the standard social casework and groupwork methods.

Bolen (10): Easing the pain of termination for adolescents

This study of the termination process among adolescents from residential treatment centers for delinquents sought to identify theoretical implications for casework and groupwork practice. The theory of termination was discussed, with particular attention to its relevance to adolescents in residence. Specific application of theory were suggested through case examples and hypothetical situations. Typical reactions to termination by the terminating youngster, his caseworker, and his group members, were also discussed.

The emphasis was on those adolescents, labeled "delinquent," who had typically experienced much rejection in their lives. Although the casework orientation was not not explicitly described, there is the implication that, at least in the writer's opinion, the goal of treatment in such cases is to help the clients develop a sense of themselves--to build their self-confidence and self-esteem--which should eventually enable them to leave the institution.

The writer proposed that termination should be a gradual process and severely criticized any termination process that does not allow at least one month's preparation. All too often, Bolen claimed, the caseworker himself is not comfortable in dealing with his client's termination, and this further aggravates the youngster's feelings of depression, anger, and rejection.

Typical reactions of soon-to-terminate adolescents were described in detail. These include regression to previous delinquent behavior, rejection of others, running away, and generally negative attention-getting behavior. Characteristic reactions of the staff were also discussed, with particular emphasis on the caseworker's inclination to focus on newly arriving clients at the expense of the emotional needs of the terminating client. Suggestions for appropriate handling of these reactions were also discussed.

Levinson (60): Communication with an adolescent in psychotherapy

This article was a theoretical discussion of the particularly unique strategies required for the successful treatment of an adolescent. Although the emphasis was on the social worker's views of and experiences in casework with adolescents, the author noted that the techniques and orientation suggested could be used in other modalities, and by other professionals.

After presenting an argument for the uniqueness of adolescence, the writer discussed what he considers to be necessary prerequisites for the therapist. Among these are a working knowledge of normal and abnormal development, familiarity with the social psychology of the familial and cultural milieu of the adolescent, an understanding of the intellectual, emotional, and symbolic ways in which an adolescent behaves, sensitivity and appreciation of adolescent difficulties, and an ability to be free within himself and sufficiently committed to helping the adolescent. Difficulties encountered during the initial and middle phases of treatment were then discussed. as were suggestions for overcoming these difficulties.

As for the initial stages of treatment, the author emphasized the need to provide a nonthreatening, sympathetic, gentle but structured initiation to the process of treatment. Throughout the gradual development of the working alliance, the worker must continually adapt theory to the particular needs of his client, borrowing from the best of both child and adult psychology. As the adolescent becomes more involved, more trusting and open, it is important for the worker to assist the adolescent in taking control of his own destiny. In explaining this process, the author presented several specific "do's" and "don'ts," based on his own understanding of the psychology of adolescence.

Although a myriad of presenting problems that beset many adolescents was discussed, the theoretical and practical techniques suggested were not problem-specific or client-specific. Two case examples were given, however, to illustrate the ways in which a positive therapeutic relationship can develop between worker and adolescent client.

Meyer, Odom, and Wax (71): Birth and life of an incentive system in a residential institution for adolescents

This report described and assessed a new incentive program tried out at a small residential center for moderately disturbed adolescents. The program employed written agreements and regulations, rewards and punishments for behaviors and attitudes, a scaled grading sytem and a system of peer judicial review. Primarily two modalities were used: group meetings for grading and assessment of each adolescent's behavior, and individual casework for each adolescent. The overall philosophy of the program was, through each of its facets, to motivate positive change in attitude and behavior, to foster concern for others, and to emphasize long-term patterns rather than isolated acts.

Although no data were provided, the researchers claimed that their statistics revealed distinguishable improvement in several areas after the first four years of the program. Some of these improvements were indicated by a measurable decrease in tension between adolescents and house parents, poor school grades, class cutting and absences, petty delinquency, shoplifting, curfew violations, and verbal abuse of adults. The authors conceded that improvement was indeed difficult to assess, even where statistics were available, since a new recreation program and an on-grounds school were developed at the same time that the incentive system was begun. Furthermore, since no strict experimental techniques were employed, there was no way to determine which variables were responsible for the apparent improvement: was it the casework, or the motivation of privileges, or the threat of loss of privileges, or a combination of these?

The administration and staff concluded that such a program can create and enhance self-esteem among adolescents, for they not only need but also want limits and rewards that are keyed to their level of functioning. While the staff recognized the program's effectiveness, they recommended further experimentation with similar programs.

Needham (79): Casework with a homosexual adolescent

The purpose of this paper was to discuss the theory and practice of casework with a homosexual adolescent. After delineating the historical anc contemporary views on homosexuality, the writer presented a detailed case illustration of a self-styled homosexual 15-year-old boy.

The casework techniques employed during the six-month treatment period of the boy included worker interaction with the people and institutions in the boy's environment, with the worker acting as both advocate and mediator. The casework goals were specific, such as helping the boy return to school, and more general, such as helping the boy develop a better sense of himself and others. The worker's philosophy was to deal with "the client in his milieu in order to effect a maximum possible personal growth with a minimization of detrimental intrapsychic conflict" (79:387). In the caseworker's view, the treatment's effectiveness was demonstrated by the boy's change of residence, his re-enrollment in school, and his beginning attempts to give up "feminine" apparel.

The writer suggested that social workers view the gay adolescent as a non-psychopathological person who needs supportive casework in adjusting to an often hostile environment. It was also recommended that the caseworker "use himself" as a role model of a caring, nondiscriminating adult, and that environmental manipulation be considered as a viable treatment technique. Cautions to guard against one's own prejudices were also discussed in the context of casework treatment with homosexual adolescents.

Pellman, McDonald, and Anson (84): The van: A mobile

approach to services for adolescents

A team of social workers from a family service agency experimented with using a mobile van to offer preventive and clinical services to adolescents who would not otherwise seek help from a conventional setting. The particular neighborhood served was predominantly middle-class but was beginning to evidence some racial tensions due to school busing and low-income housing developments. The workers looked at the van as a way to initiate troubled adolescents to therapeutic intervention. Follow-up treatment, including casework, groupwork, and family therapy, was also offered at an agency clinic in the neighborhood for those who desired further help beyond the van experience.

The initial van session usually took the form of a "rap session" whose purpose was to provide a nonthreatening but supportive and structured milieu in which the adolescent could learn to explore himself as well as to identify areas for further therapeutic work. The sessions were used by the caseworkers as diagnostic tools and as a means of planning further intervetion--whether it be casework, groupwork, family therapy, or environmental intervention.

The therapeutic team saw the van method as unique from most street workers who function entirely within the adolescent's environment. By establishing its own space within the client's environment, the van offered the opportunity for freedom of expression, but not without structure and boundaries. Furthermore, the follow-up services available enabled the van approach to allow for a wide variety of levels of commitment from its adolescent clients.

Schinke (98): Teenage pregnancy: The need for multiple casework services

Maintaining that teenage pregnancy is a complex and urgent problem involving social and psychological considerations, this researcher suggested a multi-faced approach for casework intervention. The recommended approach centers around three opportunities for casework service: primary prevention, early intervention, and the postpartum stage.

The primary prevention stage, according to the researcher, should consist of a "broad developmental conceptualization of the problem." This should include the caseworker's assessment of situational characteristics of the adolescent. The goals of casework at this stage should transcend the usual dispensation of accurate contraception information. The adolescents--boys and girls--should be helped to learn appropriate, mature, and responsible sexual attitudes and behavior. The early intervention stage would focus on exploring alternatives to bearing the child, in light of the future parents' educational and career goals. The caseworker's role at this stage is seen as that of advocate for the mother, the father, and the unborn child. Postpartum casework services would consist primarily of providing advice and assistance in obtaining concrete services such as housing, homemaker service, public assistance, and day care service. The availability of further casework, and of family and couple counseling, should also be clarified at this stage.

Tayler and Siegel (111): Treating the separation-individuation conflict

This case study of a 16-year-old self-destructive girl was presented to illustrate the use of several modalities in trying to resolve the separation-individuation crisis of each member of the girl's family. The girl, a resident of a school treatment center, was seen in casework when each of her parents were also in casework with the same worker. As the parents' treatment progressed, they were seen conjointly. The family was also encouraged to hold sessions together as a unit without the therapist. A comparison of each individual's perceptions of these family sessions, as reported to the caseworker, was used as an indicator of improvement in the family's functioning.

Much of the casework employed was based on the theoretical contributions of Blanck and Blanck, Pine, Bergman, Masterson, and Kernberg. In particular, Mahler's construct of separation-individuation was assumed to be at the foundation of each individual's difficulties.

The researchers concluded that no single treatment modality would have sufficed in the treatment of the girl's problems. Rather, success was attributed to the use of multiple techniques and modalities, based on an understanding of each individual in the girl's immediate family, and of the dynamics of the interpersonal interactions. Indicators of success were based on the observations made by the caseworker, who concluded that each family member had developed an increased understanding of his or her individuality as well as his or her effect on others. A marked change in the girl's role was noted as a primary indicator of success, as demonstrated by her advocacy of her younger sister who had begun to display behavior comparable to that of the girl's prior behavior. An indicator of her success in resolving her separation-individuation crisis was the manner in which she handled her termination from the center.

Cain (16): Social worker's role in teenage abortions

Based on her experiences with 40 adolescents who sought abortions at a large metropolitan hospital, this caseworker discussed theoretical and practical aspects of helping such girls through their crises. Comparisons with women in their 20's and 30's were made throughout the discussion in order to highlight the uniqueness of adolescents' difficulties with unwanted pregnancy.

Since usually only one session was provided for by the hospital, and since most of the girls were resistant to counseling, the caseworker viewed the intervention as short-term crisis intervention. The focus, therefore, was on helping the girl with the particular issues of deciding whether to abort, accepting responsibility for the decision, breaking the family's "conspiracy of silence," accepting responsibility for her sexuality, and finding means of prevention in the future, as well as the issue of present and possible future emotional reactions. Cain believed that if the girl could come to understand her present crisis in the context of her life-long emotional development, she would most likely be able to reap some benefits from the experience rather than become susceptible to a repetitious pattern. One difficulty encountered was that for most of the girls the abortion ended the immediate crisis but rarely the original underlying conflicts. Thus, in contrast to most older women, many adolescents used pregnancy and abortion to act out various unresolved feelings, such as the desire to replace a lost parent or to engage in a power struggle with a parent.

The caseworker recommended further research by social workers on the long-term effects of adolescent abortion. Longitudinal case studies were particularly suggested as the ideal medium for developing further knowledge and theoretical concepts in this area.

CODIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF THE STUDIES

According to Methodology

The distribution of the studies of casework with adolescents, according to their overall methological design employed, is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1 indicates that, except for the experimental design, the various methodological approaches to investigating casework with adolescents have been utilized in approximately equal proportions throughout the 1970's. However, not a single experimental study in this area has been published since 1972. A possible explanation for this may be, as pointed out earlier (see On the Conduct of a Review-Assessment Study), the apparent aversion of social work practitioners to using the client as a "guinea pig" while he is in treatment.

This possible explanation is further supported by the findings of other casework researchers. Fischer (28), for example, found that out of more than 70 studies of social casework effectiveness, only 11 were accepted as true experimental designs. Wood (119), applying an even less strict definition than Fischer (allowing quasi-experimental designs), still only accepted as experimental 22 of

Table 1

Classification of the Studies According to Methodological Design

Experimental[a]	Case Study	Theoretical Exposition[b]	Program Evaluation
Webb and Riley (1970)	McLaney (1971)	Caroff, Liberman, and Gottesfeld (1970)	Kerns (1970)
Berleman, Seaberg, and Steinburn (1972)	Needham (1977)	Bolen (1972)	Meyer, Odom, and Wax (1973)
	Taylor and Siegel (1978)	Levinson (1973)	Pellman, McDonald, and Anson (1977)
		Schinke (1978)	
		Cain (1979)	

[a] Use of a control, comparison, or contrast group.

[b] May include excerpts of individual cases as illustrations.

a possible 53 studies on casework effectiveness. Both Fischer and Wood examined casework studies with all types of clients, but not past the year 1973. Based on these facts alone, it should perhaps not be surprising to find no experimental studies on casework with adolescents appearing after 1972.

But there also seem to be other factors that may have discouraged the employment of experimental techniques in casework research in general during the latter part of the 1970's. One factor may be the publication in 1973 of Fischer's assessment of casework effectiveness (as measured experimentally), the rather negative findings, and the ensuing debate within the profession (see Other Review-Assessment Studies of Casework for a further discussion). Fischer himself, in his updated study of 1976, suggested that perhaps the experimental design was not the most appropriate for assessing casework outcome (29:152). Further, Wood (119) noted that

> . . . a number of social work writers have recently been calling for a "moratorium" on group-comparison evaluative research and for exploration of alternative research paradigms (119:455).

Of the two experimental studies, the Berleman et al. (5) study seems to have been the more carefully designed.

Yet, despite the apparent care taken in pilot-testing the comprehensive treatment approach, no statistically significant effects were found at the end of the seven-year study. Perhaps a reason for this, not suggested by the researchers, was that the experiment employed too many independent (treatment) variables. Had they been able to determine the possible interactive effects among these variables, they may have been able to isolate individual effects.

The Webb and Riley (116) study, on the other hand, employed casework as the sole interventive variable. Furthermore, no subject had more than 49 casework interviews. Regardless of the various opinions concerning short-term versus long-term casework, it is clear that in terms of research methodology the relatively short-term design has certain advantages. For one, the motivation of the experimental subject would tend to remain higher over the short-term; for another, maturational effects are minimized. Although this, among other reasons, makes any attempt to compare the two studies an illogical enterprise, there is one interesting point mentioned by Webb and Riley. Their subjects, coerced into casework by the probation department, seemed to improve in treatment despite their often-voiced objection to being there initially. The delinquent boys of the Berleman et al. (5) study, however, were volunteers. This suggests, as Webb and Riley pointed out, that initial motivation may not be a prerequisite for effective casework, nor may high initial motivation guarantee success, at least not over the long term. Had the Berleman et al. study reported intermittent results, "progress reports," information along these lines may have been revealed.

Several faults with the design of the Webb and Riley study should be noted at this point. Neither the particular casework techniques applied, nor the "behavior correlates" used as a follow-up assessment instrument, were described in detail. Furthermore, only 26 experimental subjects remained in the study at the time of assessment. Hence one is at a loss to know precisely how the researcher's "successful" casework can be applied elsewhere.

Perhaps the greatest advantage of the case study method is that it gives an opportunity to demonstrate how theory can be applied to practice and, conversely, how theory can be expanded, modified, or affirmed through examining a comprehensive example. Each of the three case studies of adolescents in casework has done this to some degree . The McLaney (67) study appears to be the weakest in terms of theory integration, in the sense that a specific theoretical framework for the treatment of drug-abusing adolescents was not specified but rather only suggested. On the other hand, the Needham (79) study combined psychoanalytic theory and contemporary societal attitudes in the treatment techniques employed with the homosexual adolescent. Similarly, the Taylor and Siegal (111) study clearly set forth a theoretical foundation concerning the separation-individuation conflict, and this was repeatedly referred to throughout the description of the casework.

Somewhat similar in design and purpose to the case study is the theoretical exposition. Although excerpts of selected cases are usually presented as illustrations, they are presented to stress a specific point in theory or technique of practice. Three of the five expositions made appropriate use of such illustrations (10, 60, 16). Of course it can be argued that a researcher interested in convincing his readership of a particular theoretical viewpoint or practice technique can always find illustrative examples to support him. But then the same argument can be applied to the case study method, and yet all of these eight studies appear to contain more information for actual practice than do the two experimental studies.

The question is apparently a matter of acceptance of the researcher's argument, and thus far it appears that experimental studies of casework with adolescents may be no more convincing than case studies or expositions. The Bolen (10) study, for example, used illustrations to develop guidelines for dealing with adolescents who are about to terminate treatment. In like fashion, Levinson (60) integrated theory, technique, and illustration in proposing a model treatment plan for adolescents; Cain (16) followed the same procedure in espousing a model plan for short-term crisis intervention.

The method of investigation used by Kerns (53), Meyer et al. (71), and Pellman et al. (84) has been designated "program evaluation," since in each case an attempt was made to establish effective casework theory and technique without using a control, comparison, or contrast group. Thus, Kerns described the experiences of the staff of a youth service agency in applying short-term casework techniques; Meyer et al. described a new incentive program applied in a residential institution; and Pellman et al. described the use of a mobile van. As in most of the expository studies, each of these researchers cited illustrative examples of how evaluation of the program's effectiveness was made. A major difference, however, is that this evaluation appears to have been ongoing. Hence, for example, Kerns' staff was able to alter certain aspects of the program once they deemed them ineffective. While this ability is clearly an advantage over the more fixed experimental design, one can never be certain of the relationship between treatment and outcome variables when treatment techniques are altered during the process. Furthermore, as with the case study and theoretical exposition methods, program evaluation reports can be greatly influenced by researcher bias. This is a particularly important consideration in these three studies, because the researcher was an integral part of the program. Perhaps a more convincing evaluation could be offered if the evaluator were an independent caseworker, especially in such studies as that of Pellman et al., where no attempt was made to compare "before and after" information.

The distribution of the studies according to the primary source-person consulted in determining the effectiveness of the casework, crossed with the dependent measure applied, is shown in Table 2. In some of the studies the method was actually used; in others, particularly the theoretical expositions, it was recommended.

Table 2 indicates that more than half of the studies

Table 2

Classification of the Studies According to Method of Determining the Effectiveness of the Casework

	Primary Source-Person Consulted			
Dependent Measure	Caseworker	Client	Others (e.g. Teachers, Parents, Police)	Caseworkers, Client and Others Equally
Perceptual Change in Client	Caroff et al. (1970)	Webb & Riley (1970)		
	Bolen (1972)	Pellman et al. (1977)		
	Levinson (1973)			
	Taylor & Siegel (1978)			
Behavioral Change in Client	McLaney (1971)		Berelman et al. (1972)	Kerns (1970)
	Needham (1977)			
	Schinke (1978)		Meyer et al. (1973)	
	Cain (1979)			

used specific changes in behavior as signs of client improvement. Of these studies, only the one by Kerns (53) consulted several sources: the adolescent client, the client's parents, the caseworker, and the client's school records. Unfortunately, however, the Kerns study did not report the degree of consistency of perception among the several sources. The Berleman et al. (5) study, on the other hand, reported some results of a secondary source (questionnaires given to the boys and their parents), which to a great extent differed from the results of the primary source (school and police records). Although the Meyer et al. (70) study solicited the perceptions of teachers, day care staff, house parents, and police, the relative consistency of these perceptions was not discussed, despite the researchers' contention that overall patterns were deemed more significant than isolated acts.

The McLaney (67), Needham (79), Schinke (98), and Cain (16) studies relied primarily on the caseworkers' judgments of the client's behavioral change. McLaney, for example, interpreted certain information revealed in treatment sessions as indicative of the girl's changing role within her family. Needham observed changes in the homosexual adolescent's dress, behavior during sessions, and interactions with significant others whom the caseworker met on several occasions. Cain recommended that caseworkers perform follow-up interviews with pregnant teenagers to determine whether the crisis casework had had any effect on the girl's behavior patterns.

It is interesting to note that a behavioral change reported by the client alone was not used as a criterion in any of the studies. When behavioral changes were reported by the client, such as in the McLaney (67) and Needham (79) studies, the caseworker reserved definitive judgment until these changes were manifested in treatment sessions or interpreted in the context of other changes observed by the caseworker. In contrast, two of the studies relied primarily on client reports of their changes in perceptions of themselves or others. Webb and Riley (116), administered two tests to their clients, at the beginning of the study and again one year later. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and a form of semantic differential revealed statistically significant changes in the girls' perceptions of themselves and of authority figures. Although a set of "behavioral correlates" were submitted to the girls' probation officers, ostensibly for corroboration, the overwhelmingly positive ratings obtained cast some doubt on the validity of this technique. Furthermore, all of the officers were aware of which girls were in casework treatment and which were not. Finally, Webb and Riley failed to describe these correlates in detail, or to provide their statistical analysis of them.

The Pellman et al. (84) study also relied primarily on the client's reports. The researchers cited clients who returned to report that they had been helped to perceive themselves differently, understand their family members better, or change their attitudes about engaging in treatment. Although no testing instrument was used by the researchers, they concluded that such reported attitudinal change was indicative of treatment success.

The Caroff et al. (18), Bolen (10), Levinson (60), and Taylor and Siegel (111) studies were the most theoretical in terms of measuring casework effectiveness. Each relied primarily on the caseworker's determination that the client's perceptions of himself and others had changed because of treatment. The goal of Caroff et al. was to enable adolescents to view drug use as a self-destructive symptom; the goal of Bolen's termination techniques was to comfort the client troubled about termination; Levinson's goal was concentrated primarily on changing only those internal, intrapsychic variables interpreted by the caseworker; and Taylor and Siegel cited as their goal indications of a change in a girl's perception of her role within her family.

It is perhaps not surprising that all of the studies that designated the caseworker as the primary determiner of casework effectiveness were either case studies or theoretical expositions (compare Table 1 and Table 2). It may be that the method of research is an outgrowth of the caseworker-researcher attitude concerning where the focus of judgment should rest. Thus a caseworker who believes that he is the most qualified judge of an adolescent's progress in treatment might be reluctant to perform a controlled experiment using objective measures, or even to report the views of the client and others on the effectivness of the casework.

According to Casework Setting

Table 3 shows how the studies are distributed according to where the casework service took place.

It is interesting to note that only one study, that of Caroff et al. (18), was reported by a caseworker in private practice. Several possible explanations can be offered. Perhaps caseworkers do not favor treating adoles-

Table 3

Classification of the Studies According to Casework Setting

Residential Center	Family Agency	Youth Center	Hospital or Court Clinic	Other	Private Practice
Bolen (1972)	Webb & Riley (1970)	Kerns (1970)	Needham (1977)	Pellman et al. (1977)	Caroff et al. (1970)
Meyer et al. (1973)	McLaney (1971)	Berelman et al. (1972)	Cain (1979)	Schinke (1978)	
Taylor & Siegel (1978)	Levinson (1973)				

cents in private practice, feeling that they can only be properly treated in an agency setting, particularly if the caseworker believes that an adolescent should be seen primarily in family treatment. Or it may be that adolescents do not seek private practitioners for casework. This would seem to be a reasonable explanation in light of the fact that only in the Pellman et al. (84) study did the adolescents actively seek help on their own. One of the assumptions of Pellman et al. was, in fact, that adolescents are fearful of mental health workers and will generally not seek them out. Thus the mobile van approach was an attempt to lower this anxiety. In each of the other studies, the adolescents were in some way coerced into treatment by a court, school, or family. Hence it is clear that adolescents, although seen in individual casework, are still apparently more like younger children than like adults in terms of where treatment is most readily available.

According to the Casework Approach

Table 4 shows the distribution of the studies accordint to the primary thrust of the casework intervention (insight-oriented or behavior-modification) crossed with the casework time frame (short- or long-term).

Table 4

Classification of the Studies According to Casework Approach

	Primary Thrust	
Time Frame	Insight-Oriented	Behavior Modification
Short-Term	Webb & Riley (1970) Pellman et al. (1977) Cain (1979)	Kerns (1970) Needham (1977) Schinke (1978)
Long-Term	Caroff et al. (1970) McLaney (1971) Bolen (1972) Levinson (1973) Meyer et al. (1973) Taylor & Siegel (1978)	Berleman et al. (1972)

In this context, short-term is less than 6 months; long-term is approximately 1 year or more. These time periods were chosen because the studies seemed to fall naturally into one time period or another. The decision on whether a particular casework approach was insight-oriented or behavior modification was based on the stated goals of treatment. That is, if the primary goal was to help the adolescent with feelings or attitudes, the casework was considered insight-oriented. If the primary goal was to help the adolescent change a specified behavior, the casework was considered behavior modification.

Certainly many, if not all, of the studies used both insight and behavior-modification approaches to some degree, but the overall emphasis of the approach was clearly one or the other. For example, the Webb and Riley (116) study's primary casework approach revolved around the women's views of themselves and others, even though a secondary measure of casework effectiveness was concerned with behavior change (the behavioral correlates rated by the women's probation officers). Similarly, McLaney's (67) casework was designed to help the girl "acquire greater esteem of herself as a woman and as an adult." Although the girl's decreased dependency on drugs was one of the many behavioral changes cited as an indicator of casework success, behavioral change was not an acknowledged goal in the treatment. (The distinction between "primary thrust" and "dependent measure" can be seen by comparing Table 4 and Table 2). Conversely, the primary goal in the Needham (79) study was to "lessen transvestite tendencies" in order to help the boy return to school, and a secondary goal, to help the boy feel more comfortable with his homosexuality. Thus none of the studies were purely insight-oriented or took a purely behavior modification approach. These are simply labels that reflect the caseworker's view of the relative importance of the two ingredients.

Although most of the studies concentrated primarily on insight gain, there appears to be no pattern of interaction between the approach variable and the time variable. At one end of the spectrum was the Cain (16) study which attempted in a single session to give the pregnant adolescents insight concerning their predicament. At the other end was the Berleman et al. (5) study which attempted, over a period of 1 to 2 years, to reduce the level of the boys' acting-out behavior.

Many of the studies employed other methods of intervention, in addition to casework with the adolescent, including peer groups, casework with parents or other family members, and a combination of these. Table 5 illustrates the studies' relative use of these methods.

In each of the studies that used another modality in addition to casework (10, 98, 18, 111, 5, 84), the same caseworker or team was involved in each modality. Thus, for example, the caseworker in the Taylor and Siegel (111) study also saw the girl's parents individually as well as conjointly, and the caseworker in the Pellman et al. (84) study encouraged the adolescents to invite their friends or family members to visit the van. The Bolen (10) study used peer group in addition to individual casework, in order to allow the adolescents to share their reactions to the impending termination of one of their members. Since this study took place in a residential treatment center, it is understandable that the termination of an individual from the residence, a frequent occurrence, should be extended to a peer group. Thus it would seem, that at least in the Bolen study, the use of groups in conjunction with casework was clearly dictated by the particular circumstances. The rationale for using modalities other than casework was not as well supported in the three other studies.

Table 5

Classification of the Studies According to Intervention

Casework Only	Casework and Group	Casework and Family	Casework, Group, and Family
Kerns (1970)	Bolen (1972)	Caroff et al.	Berleman et al. (1972)
Webb & Riley (1970)	Schinke (1978)	Taylor & Siegel (1978)	Pellman et al. (1977)
McLaney (1971)			
Levinson (1973)			
Meyer et al. (1973)			
Needham (1977)			
Cain (1979)			

According to Client Characteristics

Table 6 shows the distribution of the studies according to the age and sex of the adolescent clients. The age categories of 12 to 14, 14 to 17, and 18 or over, were chosen for the sake of clarity, so that no particular study would belong to more than one category.

Table 6 indicates that of those studies specifying the sex of the adolescent, the vast majority (six or eight) were concerned with girls. Only the delinquency prevention experiment of Berleman et al. (5) and the Needham (79) case study of a homosexual exclusively concerned male adolescents. It would be difficult to infer any significance from this apparent inequity, however, since five of the studies (53, 60, 71, 84, 18) involved male and female adolescents with approximately equal emphasis.

It is interesting however, that of the six studies that dealt with girls, four (111, 16, 67, 98) focused on sexual acting-out, pregnancy, or promiscuity as a major symptom, and a fifth (116) was to a great extent concerned with impulse gratification. Neither of the studies concerned exclusively with boys considered sexual promiscuity. Although the Needham (79) study dealt with a homosexual boy, the issue of sex was not discussed in terms of sexual

Table 6

Classification of the Studies According to Client Age and Sex

	Age			
Sex	12-14[a]	14-17	18 or Over	Not Specified
Male	Berleman et al. (1972)	Needham (1977)		
Female		Bolen (1972 Taylor & Siegel (1978) Cain (1979)	Webb & Riley (1970) McLaney (1971)	Schinke (1978)
Both		Kerns (1970) Levinson (1973) Meyer et al. (1973) Pellman et al. (1977)		Caroff (1970)

[a] None of the studies involved only 14-year-old adolescents.

behavior, but rather in terms of the boy's mannerisms, dress, and feelings. The Berleman et al. (5) study made no mention whatsoever of sexual behavior or sexual attitudes. The implication, then, is that the issue of sexual behavior, traditionally viewed differently with boys and girls, was perhaps a factor in the apparent bias of the casework studies.

While most of the studies focused on 14- to 17-year olds, ages as low as 12 (5) and as high as the early twenties (116) were considered to fall in the category of "adolescence" or "youth" (see Defining Adolescence for a detailed discussion). Thus the so-called stage of adolescence, as defined by these studies, would cover at least a decade.

Table 7 shows the distribution of the studies according to race and socieconomic class.

From Table 7 it is clear that most of the studies of casework with adolescents did not specify either the race or the class of the clients. Only three of the studies specified both race and class. Of these three studies, one (79) did not, however, consider the client's race or class as a variable in the casework treatment or assessment, and the other two (5, 84) considered only the class variable important. Of the three studies that specified either race

Table 7

Classification of the Studies According to Race and Socioeconomic Class

	Race		
Class	Caucasian	Black	Not Specified
Poor[a]		Berleman et al. (1972) Needham (1977)	Kerns (1970) Meyer et al. (1973)
Middle[b]	Pellman et al. (1977)		McLaney (1971)
Not Specified			Caroff et al. (1970) Webb & Riley (1970) Bolen (1972) Levinson (1973) Schinke (1978) Taylor & Siegel (1978) Cain (1979)

[a] On public assistance.

[b] Family owns its own home or business.

or class (53, 71, 67), only Meyer et al. (71) discussed socioeconomic class as an important variable. Thus, while six of the studies specified either race or class, only three--Berleman et al. (5), Pellman et al. (84), and Meyer et al. --deemed one of these variables important enough to deserve consideration, and in each case it was the variable of socioeconomic class.

The studies of both Pellman et al. (84) and Meyer et al. (71) employed the class variable to approach an understanding of the client's milieu, in an effort to assess properly the ongoing interactions between the client's presenting problems and his environmental influences. For the most part, however, the Berleman et al. (5) study cited the low socioeconomic class variable--which was more highly represented among the experimental subjects than among the control subjects--as a possible explanation for the failure of the casework intervention. Thus the Berleman et al. study considered the class variable in a predominantly ex post facto manner, rather than as a variable considered during the process of treatment. Because of this, the researchers could only recommend that perhaps some radically different intervention strategies are needed in work with such inner city youth.

According to Presenting Problem Areas

Table 8 shows the distribution of the studies according to the area of the clients' presenting problems. Most of the studies have been classified under more than one area.

Table 8 shows that delinquency in school was the most frequent presenting problem among adolescents, appearing in eight of the 13 studies. This finding should not be unexpected since school delinquency is probably one of the first and most clearly visible manifestations of an adolescent's disturbances.

The appearance of most of the studies within two or more areas illustrates the multi-dimensionality and inter-relatedness of the problems that beset adolescents. Only four of the studies (98, 16, 116, 53) were concerned with a single problem area. In the Schinke (98), Cain (16), and Kerns (53) studies, this singular focus could be explained as a necessary condition of the short-term approach and single goal set in these studies. The Webb and Riley (116) casework, however, spanned a somewhat longer period in most cases--sometimes as many as 6 months.

The focus on the single area of delinquency involving police, however, can be explained by the fact that the

Table 8

Classification of the Studies According to Presenting Problem Area

Peer and Family Relationships	Sexuality	Delinquency (Police)	Delinquency (School)	Alcohol or Drug Abuse	School Learning
Caroff et al. (1970)	McLaney (1971)	Webb & Riley (1970)	Kerns (1970)	Caroff et al. (1970)	Levinson (1973)
McLaney (1971)	Levinson (1973)	Bolen (1972)	Berleman et al. (1972)	McLaney (1971)	Meyer et al. (1973)
Levinson (1973) (1973)	Needham (1977)	Berleman et al. (1972)	Bolen (1972)	Levinson (1973)	
Meyer et al. (1973)	Schinke (1978)	Levinson (1973)	Levinson (1973)	Pellman et al. (1977)	
Pellman et al. (1977)	Taylor & Siegel (1978)	Pellman et al. (1977)	Meyer et al. (1973)	Taylor & Seigel (1978)	
Taylor & Siegel (1978)	Cain (1979)		Needham (1977)		
			Pellman et al. (1977)		
			Taylor & Siegel (1978)		

girls were referred by the probation office, which cooperated in the conduct and assessment of the experiment.

Overall Assessment

Table 9 summarizes, for each study, the information contained in Tables 1 through 8.

Caroff et al. (18). The most notable asset of this theoretical exposition was its recommended techniques for effecting an adolescent's perceptual change concerning the use of drugs. The casework approach was stated in specific terms and was supported with a theoretical rationale. For example, this was the rationale for not permitting the adolescent to discuss drugs after the first session.

> The drug taker is an exhibitionist. He wishes to relive the drug-induced experience by telling about it over and over again. The therapist must not be a voyeur. The orgy must be stopped. . . . Only then can the young client speak about underlying anxieties concerning his physical abilities, social maturity, relationships, and his future (18:531).

However, the researchers did not fully address the question of assessing the effects of their casework recommendations. They merely mentioned that the casework goal was to "have them experience drug usage as ego-dystonic" (18:527). There was no discussion of what might be con-

Table 9

Summary Description of the Studies

	Caroff et al. (1970)	Kern (1970)	Webb & Riley (1970)	McLaney (1971)	Berleman et al. (1972)	Bolen (1972)	Levinson (1973)	Meyer et al. (1973)	Needham (1977)	Pellman et al. (1977)	Schinke (1978)	Taylor & Siegel (1978)	Cain (1979)
Methodological Variables													
Experimental			*		*								
Case Study				*					*			*	
Theoretical Exposition	*					*	*				*		*
Program Evaulation		*						*		*			
Perceptual Change as Measure	*		*			*	*			*		*	
Behavioral Change as Measure		*		*	*			*	*		*		*
Caseworker as Source	*			*		*	*		*		*	*	*
Client as Source			*							*			
Others as Source				*				*					
Mixed Sources		*											
Interventive Variables													
Residential Center						*		*				*	
Family Agency			*	*			*						
Youth Center		*			*								
Clinic									*				*
Private Practice	*												
Other Setting										*	*		
Insight Approach	*		*	*		*	*	*		*		*	*

Table 9 (continued)

Summary Description of the Studies

	Caroff et al. (1970)	Kerns (1970)	Webb & Riley (1970)	McLaney (1971)	Berleman et al. (1972)	Bolen (1972)	Levinson (1973)	Meyer et al. (1973)	Needham (1977)	Pellman et al. (1977)	Schinke (1978)	Taylor & Siegel (1978)	Cain (1979)
Behavioral Approach		*			*				*		*		
Short-Term		*	*						*	*	*		*
Long-Term	*			*	*	*	*	*				*	
Casework Only		*	*	*			*	*	*				*
Casework and Group						*							
Casework and Family	*											*	
Casework, Group, and Family					*					*			
Client Varables													
Males					*				*				
Females			*	*		*					*	*	*
Males and Females	*	*					*	*		*			
12-14 Years old					*								
14-17 Years Old		*				*	*	*	*	*		*	*
18 or Older			*	*									
Age Not Given	*										*		
Caucasian										*			
Black					*				*				
Race Not Given	*	*	*	*		*	*	*			*	*	*
Poor Class		*			*			*	*				
Middle Class				*						*			
Class Not Given	*		*			*	*				*	*	*
Relationship Problems	*			*			*	*		*		*	

Table 9 (continued)

Summary Description of the Studies

	Caroff et al. (1970)	Kerns (1970)	Webb & Riley (1970)	McLaney (1971)	Berleman et al. (1972)	Bolen (1972)	Levinson (1973)	Meyer et al. (1973)	Needham (1977)	Pellman et al. (1977)	Schinke (1978)	Taylor & Siegel (1978)	Cain (1979)
Sexuality Problems				*			*		*		*	*	*
Police Delinquency			*		*	*	*			*			
School Delinquency		*			*	*	*	*	*	*		*	
Alcohol or Drug Abuse	*			*			*	*		*		*	
Learning Problems							*	*					

sidered reasonable indicators of the client's adoption of such a view, other than their claim that the new techniques appeared to be maintaining adolescents in treatment longer than their previous clients.

Kerns (53). The strongest methodological asset of this study appeared to be the method employed for assessing the effectiveness of the casework treatment. Three main factors contributed to the reliability and validity of this method of assessment: (a) the caseworker, the client, and the client's parents shared equally in the assessment of effectiveness; (b) the casework was short-term, goal-oriented, and contractual (with renewability); and (c) goals were stated in specific behavioral terms.

Furthermore, this method of assessment was a natural outgrowth of the intervention process, during which progress was continually monitored and reviewed, as a description of each session was recorded by the caseworker. This description had to be directly related to the original contract and had to answer the following questions: (a) What use was made of the time factor? (b) What clarifications were made concerning the goal? (c) What was the client's reaction? (d) What evidence of goal-directed behavior did the clientdemonstrate? Hence the relative success of the casework could be measured in fairly objective terms.

Although Kerns provided no statistical data that would permit one to estimate the rate and degree of success that can be anticipated from the use of these techniques, the following conclusion was offered as a guide:

> Actual practice has revealed that the appropriateness of a case situation for PSTT /planned short-term treatment/ and the degree of success in meeting the goal are not determined by the problem or psychiatric diagnosis but rather by (1) the kind of goal for which the client and worker are willing to strive; (2) the positive, intrapsychic, and external factors in the adolescent's and family's life situation which can be utilized in problem solving; and (3) the skill and confidence of the worker (53:346).

Unfortunately, however, only a few specific examples were given of items 1, 2, and 3. Thus, for example the reader is forced to draw inferences from the few case illustrations concerning the characteristics and presenting problems of adolescents who were deemed appropriate for PSTT. And so caseworkers considering the use of PSTT techniques must discover for themselves, through trial-and-error perhaps, the particular kinds of goals, client variables, and worker variables that are prerequisites of success.

Webb and Riley (116). If one views this study as an attempt to determine the effectiveness of casework in changing the self-perceptions of a certain kind of client, then one must agree that it fulfilled its purpose. In fact, the author's emphasis suggests that this was indeed their purpose, in describing and controlling, for client variables, and in describing and objectively measuring clients' perceptual change, the study appears to have been very meticulous. The following excerpt illustrates the methodological care taken in the area of client variables:

> Although no attempt was made to control for such factors as race, religion, intelligence, socioeconomic status, marital status, or criminal offense, inspection of these variables following the study revealed no significant differences in any of these factors between the experimental and control groups (116:566).

It is unfortunate, however, that the researchers' attempt to draw conclusions concerning behavioral changes in the clients was not based on data as reliable or valid as the objective tests that were applied to the self-perception measures. For not only were the behavioral correlates rated by probation officers who knew which girls were experimental subjects and which were controls, but the behavioral correlates seem to have depended on a great deal of subjective decision making. Furthermore, only a few examples of these correlates were stated by the authors.

One must therefore be careful not to accept the results of this secondary measure of effectiveness with the same degree of certainty as one would accept the results of the primary measure (perceptual change data). Although this behavioral assessment is not insignificant, the researchers should have at least cautioned the reader about its dependence on the opinions of possibly biased noncaseworker personnel.

McLaney (67). The major contribution of this study was its attempt to demonstrate how casework can result in positive behavioral changes in an adolescent client, even though the casework techniques focus primarily on helping the client gain insight. The worker detailed the substance of the casework interactions, which strove to promote the girl's development of an integrated understanding of herself, her family members, and her peers. As with any case study, one of course can be critical of the restrictive generalizability to other cases, even when client variables appear to be comparable. One might also be inclined to criticize the study's dependence on the caseworker as the sole judge of the effectiveness of treatment, albeit this judgment was based on empirical behavioral change. It must be acknowledged, however, that this study demonstrated the effects of a particular set of casework techniques on a particular type of adolescent client. Whether these effects were due solely to the intervention, however, cannot be answered definitively.

Berleman et al. (5). This study appeared to be the most methodologically rigorous in the traditional experimental sense. Yet the statistical results, which for the most part indicated no effects of the treatment, led the researchers to conclude that "to have this effort fail and to have this failure so well documented that few rationalizations can be made to mitigate the outcome inevitably raises the question of whether such interventive efforts should continue" (5:344). One is left with the conclusion, therefore, that two years of casework, groupwork, and family intervention will have no effect on the delinquent behavior of predominantly low-class black boys in their early teens. The design of the experiment, however, does not permit one to determine whether casework alone, for instance, would have any effect, or whether some effect of the experience may appear at some future time, or whether some effect other than decreased delinquency will occur. Thus, while the study was in many ways experimentally rigorous, it is conceivable that its lack of demonstrated effect may be due to its rather global approach, in which massive doses of different treatment modalities were applied in a nondifferential way in the hope of changing some predetermined type of behavior measured solely by group data.

Bolen (10). As a theoretical exposition on the do's and dont's of handling adolescent termination, this study may have provided useful advice for practice. However, its lack of specificity concerning the characteristics of the clients and the casework techniques employed make generalizability difficult, for a large part of the method of dealing with the termination process depends on what has gone on before, during treatment. Particularly relevant is the nature of the casework relationship, which in turn depends on intervention variables as well as client variables. Thus, while termination theory and technique were discussed in detail, there was only minimal reference to the presenting problems of the adolescents, their particular characteristics, the nature of their treatment experience, or the relative effectiveness of their treatment in resolving their presenting problems.

Levinson (60). This theoretical exposition, more than any of the other studies, offered theoretically based suggestions for using specific casework approaches with adolescents. Although these approaches were not keyed to specific client variables, it was suggested for example that:

> In adapting therapy to the particular needs of the adolescent, it is useful to borrow from the best of both child and adult psychotherapy. From an approach to adults, the therapist can adopt the face-to-face interview and its accompanying attributes of a sustained and psychotherapeutically useful relationship. From the treatment of children, one can borrow and make creative and flexible use of imaginative playlike activities, storytelling techniques, and fantasy productions which appeal to the adolescent's curiosity and sense of the drama of his existence (60:483).

However, what is lacking for those who wish to apply the suggested approaches to practice is a clear definition of measure of effectiveness. The emphasis on insight gain and the focus on the caseworker as an active, directive individual imply that it is the caseworker's role to determine the effectiveness of treatment, and that primarily intrapsychic variables are to be considered. Even the two illustrations offered made no mention of an objective or behavioral measure, but rather discussed the adolescents' feelings about the nature of the casework relationships.

Thus, while the casework approaches appear well-grounded in theory, the question of which approaches will be practically effective, with which particular adolescents, and with which specific problems, remains to be answered.

Meyer et al. (71). This evaluation of a multi-faceted program failed to distinguish between the effects of the casework program and the effects of the related incentive system. Furthermore, because a new recreational program and a new school program was begun concurrently, any attempt to establish a causal relationship between casework and behavioral improvement would be difficult. It can only be assumed that the casework program, which focused primarily on "motivation or emotional need," contributed in some degree to the "dramatic and sustained improvement" in school grades, school delinquency, and verbal abuse. If this was so, then this study is another example (see 67) in which casework concentrated on behavioral change through gains in insight as the measure of effect. It is unfortunate that the researchers did not report their statistics, which they claimed to have kept, on the adolescents' behavior. If they had, it might have been possible to understand why this program appeared to be so successful when the Berleman et al. (5) study, also a multi-faceted program, appeared to so unsuccessful.

Needham (79). Although this case study attempted to contribute to both the theory and the practice of casework with a homosexual adolescent, the practice aspect was discussed in little detail. The best described aspect of the caseworker's interventions concerned the caseworker's role as advocate and mediator on behalf of the boy. Thus, for example, meetings with the boy's significant others in an attempt to ameliorate his tense home environment was described in more detail than were the casework sessions. Since this researcher does not consider such interventions to be casework (see Defining Social Casework), it is difficult to isolate the relative contribution of the one-to-one casework process to the general improvement in the boy's behavior. In addition, while the boy was referred to as "homosexual" or "gay," his sexual behavior was apparently not an issue in casework. Rather, the worker concentrated on the feminine apparel and mannerisms. The following rationale was offered for this approach: "A major casework goal was to lessen transvestite tendencies to the extent that Robin could be able to attend school and not provoke community ostracism" (79:393). However, the researcher did not refer to the obvious omission of information concerning the boy's sexual activity, or lack of it. One cannot be certain, therefore, whether the client was indeed "gay" as the researcher claimed or simply exhibited transvestite behavior.

Pellman et al. (84). Perhaps the most unique aspect of this program evaluation, aside from the use of a mobile van which went out into the community, was its consideration of social, racial, and economic influences. Thus the researchers began with the premise that a particular community required mental health services "geared to the needs of the often 'forgotten' middle-class adolescent" (84:268). Throughout the casework and groupwork sessions offered in the van, the team of workers continually took into account the present and changing texture of the adolescents' environment. Thus, for example, the workers maintained that "the problems of the adolescents seen are reflective not only of inadequate familial coping mechanism . . . but also of the general fragmentation in their social milieu" (84:269). As in the Needham (79) study, however, the caseworkers also served, simultaneously, as "negotiators with the outer systems that may be troubling the adolescent, such as schools, recreational facilities, and so forth" (79:270). Therefore it is once again difficult to determine from this study the relative effects of the casework interventions. Any attempt to do so is further complicated by the fact that the researchers provided little information regarding outcome, and what was provided was primarily described in terms of the adolescents' reports of their gains in insight. The researchers did acknowledge, however, that "because the project began only a few years ago, the authors are in the process of evaluating findings" (79:268).

Schinke (98). The major contribution of this exposition on a three-phase casework approach to teenage pregnancy appeared to be its macroanalysis of this complex issue. The needs of adolescents, at each stage, were delineated, and previous unsuccessful attempts of intervention to respond to those needs were discussed. What the exposition lacked, however, was sufficient detail concerning casework techniques. For example, the author stated that "casework services in primary prevention should help adolescents learn a repertoire of interpersonal skills necessary for responsible adult roles, including appropriate sexual behavior" (98:408). While the virtue of such a goal is apparent, the researcher failed to suggest methods through which this goal might be achieved. The inclusion of a brief case illistration might have been helpful in this context. Further criticism can be made of the concentration on providing concrete services at the postpartum stage. While the importance of this function is clear, what is equally clear is the importance of providing emotional support to the new adolescent parents.

Taylor & Siegel (111). This case study aptly demonstrated the use of casework techniques well-grounded in theory. The caseworker drew on generally accepted theories of separation-individuation in developing specific casework techniques, and applied these techniques differentially to the adolescent client and to each of her parents. The researchers' rationale was that the multi-casework approach was necessary to "disentangle the family behavior patterns to enable growth to take place for all members" (111:339). One of their more novel techniques encouraging the girl and her parents to hold "family sessions" without the therapist. The caseworker, who treated each member individually, then used the relative consistency among each member's perceptions of those sessions as an indicator of treatment success. Thus the researcher claimed that "the fact that they could do it on their own was very supportive of all their needs to see themselves as independent, competent people" (111:344). Since this was the stated goal of the casework intervention, it would appear that the techniques employed were indeed effective.

Cain (16). Rather than attempt to answer questions concerning the effectiveness of crisis casework with pregnant adolescents, this study attempted to disclose significant issues that should be examined. For example, they made the following suggestion.

> An ideal person to conduct research into any delayed reactions from the abortion experience is the social worker or other clinician who has engaged a girl in ongoing treatment either at the time of the abortion or some time later. . . . There is a need for social workers to write their observations in the form of case studies in order to establish a body of knowledge on which theoretical concepts can be built (16:56).

Thus Cain offered suggestions for the kinds of issues that should be dealt with in casework, both before and after the abortion or contemplated abortion. Although a change in behavioral patterns was emphasized as the desired outcome, the caseworker recommended focusing on primarily intrapsychic variables during treatment. As acknowledged, however, only long-range follow-up studies could determine whether such an approach would indeed result in behavioral change.

Summary

Several other studies, initially considered for this review-assessment of casework with adolescents, were discarded after a closer examination revealed that they were not appropriate. These studies were rejected for three primary reasons: (a) the practice component of casework was not considered in the study; (b) the interventions described did not include one-to-one verbal interaction; and (c) the workers were not all social workers, and the study did not distinguish between the activities of the social workers and the activities of the other professionals.

The 13 studies discussed in this and the previous chapter therefore represent the contribution made by casework during the 1970's to the cause of adolescent mental health. Clearly, no one study represents a definitive statement, nor do the studies taken as a whole represent a complete theoretical or practice model for conducting casework with adolescents. For the most part, the studies were found to be deficient in the following areas: (a) the methodological design did not succeed in isolating the effects of different variables; (b) the design did not permit an examination of possible interactions between key variables; (c) the dependent measures and the methods of assessment of effectiveness were not clearly defined; (d) the casework interventions lacked detailed description; and (e) many characteristics of the clients were not discussed, particularly in terms of the role played by social, cultural, and economic factors.

However, the studies are not completely lacking in suggestive theoretical and practical components. These components form the basis of several implications for the future practice of social casework with adolescents, as well as for the future conduct of research on casework with adolescents. These two areas will be discussed in the next two chapters.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PRACTICE OF CASEWORK WITH ADOLESCENTS

This chapter is devoted to a discussion of those implications for casework practice with adolescents that have emerged from the foregoing review-assessment. Despite the generally poor methodology and lack of specificity which characterize the studies as a group, several common aspects strongly suggest likely paths toward effective practice.

It appears that the general guideline for the practice of casework with adolescents is flexibility and pragmatism, for both flexibility and pragmatism appear as recurring themes among most of the discussions and descriptions of theory and practice. In particular, the caseworker must be prepared to shift his theoretical understanding and his interventive strategy, sometimes viewing the client as a pre-adult" and sometimes as a "post-child." But this implied a real shift, not a compromise or conglomeration of approaches that might be perceived by the client as ambiguous or contradictory. Rather, this shift must be real and definitive, and must be dictated by the situation at hand and the short- and long-term needs of the adolescent;

this is the element of pragmatism.

While a well-planned strategy based on a well-formualted diagnosis may be appropriate with either younger children or adults, such an approach could not possibly keep pace with the adolescent's rapid fluctuations between the two worlds. His needs are sometimes those of a child and sometimes those of an adult, as he struggles with the developmental tasks that will help him relinquish his childish needs.

Thus the caseworker must anticipate, and adjust to, wide fluctuations between regression and growth, as the adolescent struggles with his developing sense of mastery over his own impulses and over his environment, with his attempts to separate himself from his parents, and with his search for an individual identity. It is incumbent upon the caseworker to adjust to these fluctuations, to shift accordingly, to adopt whatever strategy will help the adolescent go through this flux with a minimum amount of intrapsychic damage and a maximum amount of potential for further growth.

This theme of flexibility and pragmatism is clearly manifest in the careful structuring of the casework relationship. For example, Caroff et al. (18) insisted that the adolescents' parents strictly forbid the presence of any drugs in the home, yet the caseworkers often served as advocates on behalf of the adolescents on other issues; Levinson (60) cautioned caseworkers not to "impose . . . the moralistic facts of life as the therapist sees them" (60:484), yet suggested that there are times "to let the adolescent know where the therapist stands, what he stands for, what he accepts, and what he approves of" (60:485); and Needham (79) used himself as a model of more socially acceptable male attire, yet accepted the client's "sexual orientation as a valid and viable aspect of his personality" (79:387).

Most of the studies focused on the here-and-now concerns of their adolescent clients. Psychodynamics of their past were rarely deemed usable, except when they appeared to be contributing to the adolescent's present situation. The unresolved separation-individuation conflict examined in the Taylor and Siegel (111) study, for example, was recognized as an underlying problem shared by the adolescent and her parents. Thus casework with the parents was directed toward helping them resolve this early developmental difficulty, while casework with the girl was directed toward resolving this conflict through concentration on present relationships. By relating to parents and adolescent differently, according to their needs, the common problem was resolved in each individual to the extent necessary to open communication among them.

Although in more than half of the studies the caseworker concentrated primarily on insight gain (see Table 4), this insight was rarely concerned with early development, nor was insight gain considered a goal unto itself. Thus even those studies that used both an insight-oriented approach as well as a perceptual-change measure as the dependent variable (116, 84, 18, 10, 60, 111) were clearly concerned with the direct, practical value of this insight gain or peceptual change to the client's current functioning. In addition, in those studies in which the caseworker's primary thrust was directly aimed at a particular behavior (53, 79, 98, 5), the results were not any more effective, and in at least one case apparently not at all effective (5).

Table 4 suggests that long-term casework can be engaged in with adolescents, despite the fact that a major difficulty among adolescents is their inability to maintain stable relationships. This finding differs substantially from the recommendation of the literature on psychotherapy in general, which indicates that short-term treatment of less than three months is preferred (37).

Almost half of the studies employed modalities other than casework, in cases in which another type of intervention or the involvement of significant others was deemed necessary (see Table 5). This was done in the belief that many of the client's difficulties could be ameliorated by dealing with factors outside of the client-caseworker relationship, that certain other realities were largely responsible, or that many of the gains made by the adolescent in treatment were being negated by the behavior of others, such as parents.

Information regarding the sex, age, race and socio-economic class of the adolescents was apparently not regarded as very important (see Tables 6 and 7). Not one study considered age or sex as a distinguishing variable (except when girls were involved in sexual behavior), and only three studies (84, 5, 79) attempted to take race and class into consideration. On the other hand, information regarding the particular presenting problems of the adolescents appears to be the vital consideration (see Table 8). Thus the implication is that, in most cases, casework with adolescents can be designed primarily around the nature of the problem, and only rarely needs to consider other distinguishing characteristics of the adolescent. The failure of the Berleman et al. (4) casework, however, suggests that care must be taken in choosing to ignore these other variables, for they may indeed be crucial to the effectiveness of the intervention.

Caseworker variables were not included in the present review-assessment, because little direct information of this kind was provided in the studies, other than the fact that the workers were social workers. Indeed, this was the only criterion concerning the worker which this study set forth (see Defining Social Casework). Beyond this general requirement, however, the casework studies suggest that various characteristics of the worker are essential requirements for working with adolescents.

Perhaps the most important such requirement is a knowledge of adolescent development--its relation to child development and its unique aspects. This includes an understanding of the physical, emotional, and adaptive aspects which uniquely characterize adolescence. Furthermore, the caseworker must possess the personal qualities of warmth, empathy, and respect to a greater degree than is usually required, in order to facilitate his role as an ally to the adolescent. Conversely, the caseworker must be prepared to be active and directive, to maintain a mature and structured relationship, in order to afford the adolescent an opportunity for reality testing. Thus knowledge, understanding, respect, and stability appear to be the vital characteristics that a caseworker must possess if he is to work effectively with adolescents.

Two characteristics of the worker which emerged from the studies to a much lesser degree were enthusiasm and optimism. While certainly many of the studies conveyed a strong sense of wanting to help adolescents, most conveyed the impression that adolescence is a state of being that requires correction, rather than an opportunity to pave the way for a hopeful future. This subtle difference in attitude is manifest in a comparison of the views of A. Freud (33) and Erikson (23). A. Freud's concept of adolescence was that it is an "interruption of normal growth" (33:275), while Erikson's concept was that it is "a normal phase of increased conflict characterized by a seeming fluctuation in ego strength, and yet also by a high growth potential" (23:116).

The paucity of casework studies with adolescents, particularly in the private practice setting (see Table 3), further suggests the possible reluctance of social workers to do casework with adolescents. Although it is recognized, as cited by Levinson, that the adolescent often "fails to seek treatment voluntarily, not recognizing his own problems and inner pains and not wishing to do anything about himself" (60:482), it is also recognized that "few agencies and few workers specialize in the treatment of the adolescent; there is often a lack of appreciation of the multitude of factors, attitudes, and qualities that are essential" (60:480). It is also recognized that the high degree of sensitivity, volatility, urgency, and dependency that characterize the adolescent puts an additional strain on the worker's ability to manage his countertransference--a strain that many workers are not eager or able to face.

Thus, according to Steele (109) and Lamb (57), if a caseworker is to be enthusiastic and optomistic about treating adolescents, he must first "be free of emancipation problems of his own" (109:155), be willing to "lend himself to the adolescent along the adolescent's line of direction" (109:156), "be able to tolerate a great deal of dependency" (57:177), be able to "tolerate an abrupt ending to this dependency" (57:12), and, in general, the caseworker must "have worked through his or her own adolescence" (57:13).

While the demands on the caseworker may seem great, one cannot refute the positive side of the challenge--the opportunity to facilitate the growth of future adults. In the broader sociocultural context, Esman (25) has viewed this challenge as necessary for social change:

> Hungry for new values to replace those decathected in the normal "second individuation process," the young person seizes on those offered him by the culture and seeks to integrate them with what has gone on before. In times of kaleidoscopic social change, this process may appear chaotic and disruptive. . . . But it is this quality that underlies the idealism of youth which is, at its best, its most appealing characteristic (25:54).

In summary, the review-assessment presented here has revealed the nature and extent of the contribution made by social casework during the 1970's to the better understanding and treatment of adolescents. In general, the following points have been offered as essential components in casework with adolescents, whether directly suggested, or directly or indirectly implied:

1. Flexibility is necessary in diagnosis, interventive strategy, and theoretical rationale.
2. Pragmatism is necessary in selecting interventive strategies and making interpretations.
3. An ability to shift between the "child orienta-

tion" and the "adult orientation" is required.

4. Concern with the present and future, with little emphasis on psycho-deynamics of the past, should be the primary emphasis.
5. Differential involvement of parents or others, possibly in their own casework with the same worker, should be considered.
6. Long-term casework can be successfully engaged in.
7. Concentration on insight gain can result in a successful outcome.
8. Socioeconomic variables may be crucial at times, irrelevant at other times.
9. Knowledge, understanding, respect, and stability are necessary attributes for the caseworker to possess.
10. A positive, hopeful attitude is a necessary characteristic of the caseworker, and it often depends on the quality of the caseworker's own prior adolescent experience.
11. Adolescence should be viewed as a time to explore future potential, with enthusiasm and optimism.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH ON CASEWORK WITH ADOLESCENTS

It is encouraging to note that most of the reports of casework with adolescents reviewed here have apparently been motivated by the desire to impart knowledge that can be useful for practice. This aim is consistent with the general trend in psychotherapeutic research during the 1970's. Polansky and Kent (89) have described this trend as

> . . . a shift . . . in the relatively greater weight placed on studies of how to help and the seeming decline in the volume of studies of etiology, the causes of what went wrong. . . . This is an encouraging and healthy direction, especially when studies go beyond evaluating what has been done to include leads about what might be tried that could be more fruitful (89:189).

In terms of their ability to maximize the applicability of the results, however, the casework studies for the most part fell short of their intentions. Most of the studies lacked the methodological sophistication required to convince the reader that the proposed theory or practice strategy should indeed be adopted since it would probably result in effective casework for the adolescent. Thus the diligent reader who questions the relative merit of a particular study would have to engage in a kind of review-assessment of other relevant literature to determine the study's consistency among other findings. This would, of course, be a rather inefficient procedure, particularly for the caseworker who has little interest in conducting research, and who is merely interested in being sufficiently convinced that a new or different approach is worthy of consideration.

But even if one accepts Briar's (13) claim that "most practitioners regard research literature as the last place they would look for answers to practice questions" (13:133), one would find it difficult to deny the challenge from outside the profession. The fact that casework practice has been questioned more during the 1970's than in previous years, and that there is less of a willingness to accept, at face value, the claims of a caseworker's competence, make it even more incumbent upon each individual research effort to demonstrate that its claims can stand up to objective scrutiny. Thus most of the studies on casework dealing with adolescents reviewed here must be faulted for their inability, taken individually, to be overwhelmingly convincing. These faults form the basis for proposing some recommendations for future research on casework with adolescents.

It is recommended that more casework practitioners who work with adolescents publish the results of their work. As noted previously (see Limitations of the Study), only those studies that have appeared in print could possibly be included in this review assessment. Unfortunately, and as cited by Briar, it must be recognized that much worthy work has never been, or never will be, made public, particularly the work of the many effective practitioners who cannot or will not share their experiences (13:134).

It is recommended that regardless of the methodological design employed, researchers carefully define and operationally describe the independent and dependent variables. In particular, if the casework process as the primary independent variable, and some measure of effectiveness as the primary dependent variable, are not described in sufficient detail, then any possible merits of the study may be overshadowed by its critics' voices. This essentially was the fate of the otherwise noteworthy study "Girls at Vocational High" (70), considerable discussions of which are readily available elsewhere (28, 100).

It is recommended that all pertinent characteristics of the adolescent client be reported, whether or not they were actually taken into consideration during treatment.

Variables such as age, sex, socioeconomic class, and race may indeed be vital considerations in the applicability or generalizability of certain casework interventions, under certain circumstances, with certain adolescents who have certain problems. This recommendation is made on the strength of the premise, cited by Briar and Conte, that there is "one characteristic on which everyone agrees, namely, that intervention objectives are individualized for each client" (14:27). Furthermore,

> . . . it is possible that any set of outcome measures, no matter how lengthy, might still omit a measure for the particular objective of intervention established in a specfic case and, therefore, would be irrelevant to an evaluation of the effectiveness of casework with a specific client (14:27).

It is recommended that periodic assessment be made of the effectiveness of the interventions, in addition to the usual assessment applied at termination. While this recommendation is by no means a new one, it has apparently not been followed in all but one of the casework studies reviewed here. Only the Kerns (53) study reported using this kind of procedure, in the establishment, evaluation, and renegotiation of short-term contracts with the clients. Given the ever-present maturational and historical effects that threaten to contaminate even the best research designs, together with the volatility of the adolescent personality, this recommendation is deserving of consideration, particularly with regard to long-term casework.

It is further recommended that a follow-up attempt to assess the effectiveness of the interventions be made sometime after termination. It is assumed here that casework with adolescents ought to be as much concerned with the future functioning of the clients as with helping them with their present difficulties. It would therefore seem reasonable for casework researchers to be interested in determining whether certain gains have a latent quality, manifesting themselves only after the passing of time has permitted the integration of these gains. Yet only two of the casework studies reported using or suggested using such a procedure (16, 116).

Finally, it is recommended that reports of casework failure with adolescents be given equal space in the professional literature, for much can be learned from a well-designed study, regardless of the outcome. Unfortunately, not since the Berleman et al. (5) study of 1972 has any published study of casework with adolescents admitted a negative outcome. Caseworkers should not be intimidated and stifled by the current demands for proofs of effectiveness; rather they should be encouraged even more to want to contribute to the ever-growing base of knowledge. Only in this way can caseworkers establish a complete and effective theoretical model for the treatment of adolescents.

A RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER REVIEW-
ASSESSMENT STUDIES OF CASEWORK

The primary task of this research study has been to review, assess, and codify the studies of social casework with adolescents that have been reported during the 1970's (see Statement of the Research Problem). Throughout, this researcher's concern has been twofold: to determine the contribution to adolescents made by one particular mental health practice, casework, and to evaluate the quality of that contribution in terms of its significance to the future practice of the profession. It is by no means being suggested that these two concerns have been replaced with a definitive model that can insure only the most successful results for every adolescent engaged in casework, for the state of casework, as a theory and a practice, depends as much on undefinable characteristics of the individual practitioner as the state of adolescence depends on the not yet fully developed personality of the individual adolescent.

Perhaps social casework cannot, after all, be defined in such a way that it applies to all caseworkers, all interventive strategies, all theories, and all worker-client interactions. And perhaps, after all, the effectiveness cannot be defined for all clients with all types of problems. But the effort, this researcher believes, is a worthy enterprise, for if even only one caseworker learns one new approach which will result in some benefit for one particular client, then the knowledge base of social casework has been expanded.

While this researcher's concern has been the welfare of the adolescent client, it is recommended that similar review-assessments be periodically carried out for other particular client groups or for particular problem areas. Although global review-assessments of casework studies involving all types of clients with all types of problems may stimulate some professionals to take stock of the overall contribution of their work, too often such global studies lead not to the improvement of casework but to the continuation of bitter controversy--charges and countercharges--within the profession (29, 119, 31, 120).

Rather than attempt to prove or disprove the effectiveness of social casework, future review-assessment studies should be concerned with evaluating the profession's past performance to see what can be learned to improve future practice. There is no end to this process, no final statement that casework either has reached the pinnacle called "effectiveness" or has "died." Rather, the casework profession is much like the casework process: it changes and grows continuously, sometimes making great leaps and sometimes making only slight adjustments, but always expanding as new knowledge is added.

REFERENCES

1. Alexander, L. B., & Siman, A. Fishers's study of studies. (Review of Is casework effective? A review, by J. Fisher). Social Work, 1973, 18(4), 104-106.

2. Anthony, E. J. Between yes and no: The potentially neutral area where the adolescent and his therapist can meet. Psychosocial Process, 1974, 3 (2), 23-46.

3. Basler, B. H. (Ed.). Psychotherapy of the adolescent. New York: International Universities Press, 1957.

4. Berleman, W. C. Review of The Wincroft youth project: A social-work programme in a slum area by C. S. Smith, M. R. Farrant, & H. J. Marchant. Social Service Review, 1973, 47(2), 290-292.

5. Berleman, W. C. , Seaberg, J. R., & Steinburn, T. W. The delinquency prevention experiment of the Seattle Atlantic Street Center: A final evaluation. Social Service Review, 1972, 46(3), 323-346.

6. Berman, I. R. The individual therapist in the residential treatment of the severely disturbed adolescent, Psychosocial Process, 1971, 2(1), 55-60.

7. Biestek, F. P. The casework relationship. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1957.

8. Blos, P. Relections on modern youth. Psychosocial Process, 1971, 2(1), 11-21.

9. Blos, P. The adolescent passage. New York: International Universities Press, 1979.

10. Bolen, J. K. Easing the pain of termination for adolescents. Social Casework, 1972, 53(9), 519-527.

11. Briar, S. Family services and casework. In. H. S. Mass (Ed.), Research in the social services: A five-year review. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971.

12. Briar, S. Effective social work intervention in direct practice: Implications for education. Paper presented at the meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, San Francisco, February, 1973.

13. Briar, S. Incorporating research into education for clinical practice in social work: Toward a clinical science in social work. In A. Rubin & A. Rosenblatt (Eds.), Sourcebook on research utilization. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1977.

14. Briar, S., & Conte, J. R. Families. In H. S. Maas (Ed.), Social service research: Review of studies. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1978.

15. Briar, S., & Miller, H. Problems and issues in social casework. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.

16. Cain, L. P. Social worker's role in teenage abortions. Social Work, 1979, 24(1), 52-56.

17. Canzona, L. A model to measure changes in social casework: An exploratory study to design a mathematical model for measuring change attained by individual clients undergoing social casework treatment (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1972). Social Service Review, 1973, 47(3), 437-438.

18. Caroff, P., Lieberman, F., & Gottesfeld, M. L. The drug problem: Treating preaddictive adolescents. Social Casework, 1970, 51(9), 527-532.

19. Dea, K. L. Concept of self in interpersonal relationships as perceived by delinquent and nondelinquent youth (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1970. Social Service Review, 1970, 44(3), 339.

20. Deykin, E. Y. Life functioning in families of delinquent boys: An assessment model. Social Service Review, 1972, 46(1), 90-102.

21. Dinoff, M., Serum, C., & Rickard, H. C. Controlling rebellious behavior through successive contracts. Child Care Quarterly, 1972, 1(3), 205-211.

22. Douds, A. F., Engelsjerd, M., & Collingswood, T. R. Behavior contracting with youthful offenders and their parents. Child Welfare, 1977, 56(6), 409-417.

23. Erickson, E. Identity and the life cycle. New York: International Universities Press, 1959.

24. Erickson, E. H. Identity: youth and crisis. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1968.

25. Esman, A. H. Consolidation of the ego-ideal in contemporary adolescence. Psychosocial Process, 1971, 2(1), 47-54.

26. Esman, A. H. (Ed.). The psychology of adolescence. New York: International Universities Press, 1975.

27. Fanshel, D. Review of crisis in child mental health: Challenge for the 1970's by the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. Social Service Review, 1971, 45(4), 517-518.

28. Fischer, J. Is casework effective? A review. Social Work, 1973, 18(1), 5-20.

29. Fischer, J. The effectiveness of social casework. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C Thomas, 1976.

30. Fischer, J. Effective casework practice: An eclectic approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1978.

31. Fischer, J. Isn't casework effective yet? Social Work, 1979, 24(3), 245-247.

32. Flomenhaft, K. Treatment of emotionally disturbed adolescents (Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1970). Social Service Review, 45(3), 336-337.

33. Freud, A. The psychoanalytic study of the child (Vol. 8). New York: International Universities Press, 1958.

34. Gelin, B. A. The development of principles and methods for measuring effectiveness in child welfare research (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1970). Social Service Review, 1971, 45(3), 338.

35. Goldsmith, J. Review of Youth: Transition to adulthood by the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee. Social Service Review, 1974, 48(3), 610-612.

36. Grey. A. L., & Dermody, H. E. Reports of casework failure. Social Casework, 1972, 534-543.

37. Gurman, A. S. The efficacy of therapeutic interventions in social work: A critical re-evaluation. Journal of Health & Social Behavior, 1974, 15, 136-141.

38. Gurman, A. S., & Kniskern, D. P. Research on marital and family therapy: Progress, perspective and prospect. In S. L. Garfield & A. E. Bergin (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

39. Hamilton, G. Theory and practice of social casework. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

40. Hartman, A. But what is social casework? Social Casework, 1971, 52, 411-419.

41. Haskell, S. C. A time-referenced Q-sort technique for evaluating behavioral change. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1979, 49(1), 109-120.

42. Hollis, F. A typology of casework treatment. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1968.

43. Hollis, F. The psychosocial approach to the practice of casework. In R. W. Roberts & R. H. Nee (Eds.), Theories of social casework. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

44. Hollis, R. Casework: A psychosocial therapy (2nd ed.). New York: Random House, 1972.

45. Hudson, W. W. Casework as a causative agent in client deterioration: A research note on the Fischer assessment. Social Service Review, 1974, 48(3), 442-449.

46. Jacob, T., Magnussen, M. G., & Kemler, W. M. A follow-up of treatment terminators and remainers with long-term and short-term symptom duration. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1972, 9(2), 139-142.

47. Jerome, J. Catching them before suicice. The New York Times Magazine, January 14, 1979, pp. 30-33.

48. Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. Crisis in child mental health: Challenge for the 1970's. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

49. Kadushin, A. Assembling social work knowledge. In Building social work knowledge. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1964.

50. Kadushin, A. Child welfare. In H. S. Maas (Ed.), Research in the social services: A five-year review. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971.

51. Kadushin, A. Children in adoptive homes. In H. S. Maas (Ed.), Social service research: Reviews of studies. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1978.

52. Kenniston, K. & The Carnegie Council on Children. All

our children. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.

53. Kerns, E. Planned short-term treatment, a new service to adolescents. *Social Casework*, 1970, *51*(6), 340-346.

54. Kiell, N. *The adolescent through fiction*. New York: International Universities Press, 1959.

55. Kilwein, J. H. The social class of young adults and their views on family relations, education, careers, and health (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1973), *Social Service Review*, 1973, *47*(3), 455.

56. Kushler, M. G., & Davidson, W. S. Using experimental designs to evaluate social programs. *Social Work Research and Abstracts*, 1979, *15*(1), 27-32.

57. Lamb, D. *Psychotherapy with adolescent girls*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

58. Langley, M. H., & Drone, H. B. Juvenile justice: Reneging on a sociolegal obligation. *Social Service Review*, 1973, *47*(4), 561-570.

59. Lesser, S. R. Social experience and adolescent analytic therapy. *Psychosocial Process*, 1971, *2*(1), 23-31.

60. Levinson, H. Communication with an adolescent in psychotherapy. *Social Casework*, 1973, *54*(8) 480-488.

61. Lowry, F. The client's needs as the basis for differential approach in treatment. In *Differential approach in case work treatment*. New York: Family Welfare Association of America, 1936.

62. Luborsky, L., Auerbach, A. H., Chandler, M., Chohen, J., & Bachrach, H. M. Factors influencing the outcome of psychotherapy: A review of quantitative research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1971, *75*, 145-185.

63. Maas, H. S. Developing theories of social work practice. In Building social work knowledge. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1964.

64. Marshall, R. J. The treatment of resistances in psychotherapy of children and adolescents. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1972, 9(2), 143-148.

65. Massarik, R. The survey method in social work: Past, present, and potential. In C. Y. Glock (Ed.), Survey research in the social sciences. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

66. McKenry, P. C., Walters, L. H., & Johnson, C. Adolescent pregnancy: A review of the literature. The Family Coordinator, 1979, 28(1), 17-28.

67. McLaney, M. J. Casework with a troubled teen-ager and drug abuser. Social Casework, 1971, 52(9), 553-561.

68. Merton, R. K. Social theory and social structure. Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1949.

69. Meyer, C. H. Social work practice: A response to the urban crisis. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

70. Meyer, H. J. Borgatta, E. F., & Jones, W. C. Girls at vocational high: An experiment in social work intervention. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.

71. Meyer, M., Odom, E. E., & Wax, B. S. Birth and life of an incentive system in a residential institution for adolescents. Child Welfare, 1973, 52(8), 503-509.

72. Meyers, D. I. A new adolescent? Psychosocial Process, 1971, 2(1), 5-8.

73. Meyers, H. C. The therapist's response to today's adolescent. Psychosocial Process, 1971, 2(1), 38-46.

74. Mintz, I. L. Some theoretical and technical considerations in the treatment of adolescents. Psychosocial Process, 1971, 2(1), 61-75.

75. Morris, R., (Editor-in-Chief), Dana, B., Glasser, P., Marks, R., Rein, M., Schreiber, P., & Saunders, B. (staff Editor-in-Chief). Encyclopedia of Social Work, Seventh Issue (2 vols.). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1971.

76. Mullen, E. J. Casework communication. Social Casework. 1968, 546-551.

77. Mullen, E., Chazin, R., & Felstein, D. Preventing chronic dependency. New York: Community Service Society, 1970.

78. Munson, C. E. The concepts of effectiveness and efficiency applies to the social work profession: An historical perspective. Journal of Education for Social Work, 1978, 14(2), 90-97.

79. Needham, R. Casework intervention with a homosexual adolescent. Social Casework, 1977, 58(7), 387-394.

80. Nitzberg, P. Review of The effectiveness of social casework by J. Fischer. Clinical Social Work Journal, 1978, 6(3), 246-248.

81. Norman, S. The youth service bureau: A key to delinquency prevention. Paramus, N. J.: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972.

82. Palmer, T. B. Matching worker and client in corrections. Special Work, 1973, 18(2), 95-103.

83. Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee. Youth: Transition to adulthood. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

84. Pellman, R., McDonald, R., & Anson, S. The van: A mobile approach to services for adolescents. Social Casework, 1977, 58(5), 268-275.

85. Perlman, H. H. Social casework: A problem-solving process. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

86. Perlman, H. H. Persona: Social role and personality. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

87. Perlman, H. H. The problem-solving model in social casework. In R. W. Roberts & R. H. Nee (Eds.), Theories of social casework. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

88. Phillips, G. L. The centrality of autonomy in psychotherapy with the adolescent. Child Welfare, 1970, 49(2), 78-81.

89. Polansky, N. A., & Kent, M. L. Troubled people. In H. S. Maas (Ed.), Social service research: Reviews of studies. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1978.

90. Reckless, W. C., & Dinitz, S. The prevention of juvenile delinquency: An experiment. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1972.

91. Reid, W. J. Implications of research for the goals of casework. Smith College Studies in Social Work, 1970, 140-154.

92. Reid, W. J., & Epstein, L. Task-centered casework, New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.

93. Reynolds, B. C. Whom do social workers serve? Social Work Today, 1935, 2(8).

94. Richmond, M. E. What is social case work? An introductory description. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1922.

95. Roback, H. B. The comparative influence of insight and non-insight psychotherapies on therapeutic outcome: A review of the experimental literature. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1971, 8(1), 23-25.

96. Rosenberg, M. L., & Brody, R. The threat or challenge of accountability. Social Work, 1974, 19(3), 344-350.

97. Russian, R. B. Idealization during adolescence. Smith College Studies in Social Work, 1975, 45(3), 211-229.

98. Schinke, S. P. Teenage pregnancy: The need for multiple casework services. Social Casework, 1978, 59(7), 406-410.

99. Schwartz, E. E. Macro social work: A practice in search of some theory. Social Service Review, 1977.

100. Segal, S. P. Research on the outcome of social work therapeutic interventions: A review of the literature. Journal of Health & Social Behavior, 1972, 13, 3-17.

101. Seng, M. Review of The youth service bureau: A key to delinquency prevention by S. Norman. Social Service Review, 1973, 47(1), 158-159.

102. Shireman, C. H. Review of The prevention of juvenile delinquency: An experiment by W. C. Reckless & S. Dinitz. Social Service Review, 1973, 47(2), 292-293.

103. Shore, M. F., & Massimo, J. L. After ten years: A follow-up study of comprehensive vocationally oriented psychotherapy. American Journal of Orthospychiatry, 1973, 43(1), 128-132.

104. Simon, B. K. Social casework theory: An overview. In R. W. Roberts & R. H. Nee (Eds.), Theories of social casework. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

105. Simon, B. K. Review of Problems & issues in social casework by S. Briar & H. Miller. Social Service Review, 1972, 46(3), 487-495.

106. Smalley, R. E. The functional approach to casework

practice. In R. W. Roberts and R. H. Nee (Eds.), Theories of social casework. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

107. Smith, C. S., Farrant, M. R., & Marchant, H. J. The Wincroft youth project: A social-work programme in slum area. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1972.

108. Spergel, I. A. Community based delinquency-prevention programs: An overview. Social Service Review, 1973, 47(1), 16-31.

109. Steele, E. A. Discussion of preceding chapters. In B. H. Balser (Ed.), Psychotherapy of the adolescent. New York: International Universities Press, 1957.

110. Strean, H. S. Clinical social work theory and practice. New York: The Free Press, 1978.

111. Taylor, S. S., & Siegel, N. Treating the separation-individuation conflict. Social Casework, 1978, 59(6), 337-344.

112. Thomas, E. J. Behavioral modification and casework. In R. W. Roberts & R. H. Nee (Eds.), Theories of social casework. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

113. Thompson, J. D. Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.

114. Tropp, E. Expectation, performance, and accountability. Social Work, 1974, 19(2), 139-148.

115. Turner, F. J. Reflections on clinical practice: Enough of art, more of science. Clinical Social Work Journal, 1975, 3(2), 128-134.

116. Webb, A. P., & Riley, P. V. Effectiveness of casework with young female probationers. Social Casework, 1970, 51(9), 566-572.

117. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, Springfield,

Mass.: G. & C. Merriman Co., 1972.

118. Wolins, M. Measuring the effect of social work intervention. In N. A. Polansky (Ed.), Social work research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

119. Wood, K. M. Casework effectiveness: A new look at the research evidence. Social Work, 1978, 23(6), 437-458.

120. Wood, K. M. There are reviews, and then there are reviews. Social Work, 1979, 24(3), 248-249.

VITA

Robert R. Triana, Certified Social Worker, graduated from Gannon College in 1961 with a B.A. in Sociology. After receiving his Masters in Social Work at Fordham University in 1963, Mr. Triana went on for postgraduate training in psychoanalysis at Long Island Consultation Center.

In 1970 Mr. Triana opened a private practice in psychotherapy which, with the addition of other social work practitioners, was soon incorporated as Triana & Associates. In 1974 Mr. Triana founded The Psychoanalytic Institute for Clinical Social Work, a nonprofit educational and treatment facility designed exclusively by, for, and about social workers. The Institute was charted by the New York State Board of Regents in 1976.

Mr. Triana taught for 8 years at Fordham University's Graduate School of Social Services, where he specialized in the field of alcohol and addictions. He has published an article on the treatment of the alcoholic, and has also given talks and led siminars on this and other psychotherapeutic subjects. In addition, Mr. Triana has been guest speaker for various community groups and guest columnist for a local newspaper, discussing issues such as lonliness, relationships, parenthood, and aging. Mr. Triana has also served as a consultant to professional individuals and groups, applying his expertise to the fields of management, law, and medicine. A member of several professional organizations, Mr. Triana maintains his interest in the application of social science theory and technique to business, health, law, and education.